

ORIGINAL ENGLISH EDITION

2284 567 Jaz  
FEB 20 '45

# The QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 563

JANUARY, 1945

VOL. 28  
1945

Vol. 283

1. France of To-morrow.  
By Sir John Pollock, Bt.
2. The Christian Attitude to the War and the Peace.  
By The Rt Rev. The Lord Bishop of Gloucester,  
C.H., D.D.
3. The Bank of England and Bretton Woods.  
By Sir J. A. R. Marriott.
4. An Early Victorian Diary.  
By The Earl of Bessborough, G.C.M.G.
5. India in 1944.  
By Sir Verney Lovett, K.C.S.I.
6. The Law and Poor Persons.  
By Claud Mullins.
7. Soviet Courts and Constitutional Rights.  
By E. O. Walford, LL.D.
8. Lord Hardinge of Penshurst.  
By Captain A. L. Kennedy, M.C.
9. Britain at War.  
By Lord Gorell, C.B.E., M.C.

Some Recent Books.

Published Quarterly by  
**THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY**

*Sole Agents for American Continent*

131 VARICK STREET, NEW YORK

Single Copies, \$1.75

Yearly Subscription, \$6.50

Entered at New York Post Office as Second Class Matter  
LONDON: JOHN MURRAY

**TO SUBSCRIBERS**  
**AND AGENCIES**

Commencing with the January 1938 issue of the "QUARTERLY REVIEW," Subscribers will be supplied by the INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY, 131 VARICK STREET, NEW YORK CITY, to whom all renewals and enquiries regarding this periodical should be sent.

THE  
QUARTERLY  
REVIEW

No. 563.

PUBLISHED IN  
JANUARY, 1945

LONDON:  
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.1.

1945

# WHERE THERE'S NEED —

THE NEW YORK  
PUBLIC LIBRARY

3780288

ASTOR, LENOX,  
TILDEN FOUNDRY  
1943



Registered under the  
Charities Act, 1960

## THE FAST-MOVING FRONT

As the Forces of the United Nations press their way forward, hour by hour, Salvation Army Mobile Canteens follow them to render that cheerful Christian service which has become familiar on a score of battle fronts.

Salvation Army Mobile Canteens now serving in France, specially designed and equipped to meet present conditions, are staffed by men and women qualified by experience in France, North Africa, Persia, Italy, Egypt.

Many more Mobile Canteens, Clubs and Leave Hostels are still needed.

Help to provide them by sending a gift today to

GENERAL CARPENTER, 101 QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, LONDON, E.C.4.

# THERE'S THE SALVATION ARMY!

• THE ARMY THAT SERVES ON EVERY FRONT •

Printed in Great Britain by WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, Limited, London and Beccles.

THE  
QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 563.—JANUARY 1945.

Art. 1.—FRANCE OF TO-MORROW.

FRANCE, General de Gaulle has said, must depend on herself. That is true. Nevertheless France of to-morrow depends in part on England of to-day. Not only in the sense that will strike most people but in one deeper and wider. For it is on our attitude towards France to-day that our relations with France to-morrow will depend, and on our relations with France will depend the policies and the tendencies. The influence of this country's acts on France will be felt potently in two directions. First, and with most immediate effect, on French foreign policy. Second, less visibly, but perhaps with not less force, on France's internal affairs, and this without any intention on our part to poke our noses into what does not concern us. France as a whole, both externally or internally, will be affected by England.

It is a plain fact that we have had to fight the present war because we did not maintain our alliance with France that enabled us to defeat Germany's aggressive might in 1918. So glad were we at having escaped the immediate danger that we overlooked the possibility of its recurrence. Warnings, from Germany as well as from Allied observers, were brushed aside, and we acted as though we had no need to guard ourselves from any recrudescence of German aggression. We dropped our alliance with France.

'He who is master of the Rhine,' Marshal Foch told a full assembly of the Peace Conference on May 7, 1919, 'is master of Germany. He who is not on the Rhine has lost everything.' The guarantees against German aggression imposed on France by her Allies were, in Foch's biting phrase, 'equal to zero.' It was with difficulty that the Marshal was persuaded to be present at the signing of the Treaty of Peace. When the ceremony was over, he turned to Klotz, the French Minister of Finance, and said

to him contemptuously : ' With a treaty like that you can go to the cashier of the German empire, and you can whistle for your money.'

It is useful that we should remind ourselves of this bit of history now. In 1919 Great Britain as a whole was animated by the best intentions. The war that was just over had been described by authoritative voices as ' a war to end war.' Nevertheless at the first possible moment, and at the most crucial juncture, we took an irretraceable step in the direction of making another war inevitable. If the greater number of Englishmen have forgotten this now, the French have not. In this October 1944, a few weeks after the insurrection of Paris had enabled the French to wrest their capital from enemy claws, England's prestige stands high with France. French memories are indeed better than ours. While we have to recall almost with an effort the part we played in 1940 and have to be urged not to allow our claim as the leading combatant for liberty to go by default, the stand made by England when almost unarmed she defied victorious Germany and the R.A.F. drove the Luftwaffe from the skies, fills France with admiration. The French remember most clearly, if we do not, that England then stood alone, quite alone, and won through the worst alone, before ever the United States was spurred into the war by Pearl Harbour, and the Soviet Union driven into it by Hitler's invasion.

Great Britain is therefore in an excellent position with regard to France. We benefit too by minor, yet important, advantages in reputation. During the long period of attacks on German communications and military establishments in France and on Germanised industrial works there the marksmanship of the R.A.F. was brilliantly accurate. The minimum of damage by British bombers was done to civilians, for which the population showed its gratitude by saving at the peril of their own lives some thousand of our airmen baling out over France and furthering them on their way back to England. The same cannot be said with regard to the air forces of other Allied nations. Since the relief of Paris British soldiers and officials have earned a good mark by their modest behaviour in the capital, whereas the American command had the unfortunate idea of supplying Paris taxis with petrol, but reserving their use exclusively for American officers,

while French citizens went on foot or cycled. As this was precisely what the Germans had done in favour of their officers, the popularity of the step may easily be imagined. England by comparison has started well.

But there is one question that every Frenchman asks of England, and will go on asking until a clear answer is given and, if given in the right sense, is substantiated by our action. This is : 'What are you going to do about Germany ?' The French have good reason to ask : they owe four years of pillage and oppression, and the loss of a number of Frenchmen at present incalculable as the result of imprisonment in Germany and deportation to hard labour there, to our breakaway in 1919. True, the leaders of Great Britain and a great portion of the Press have declared that we mean to put the Nazi party out of business and to demilitarise Germany for ever. But much the same was said after the last war. Lord Cranborne indeed, speaking for the Government, said at the end of September last that he could not distinguish altogether between the Nazi party and the German people, and that the latter too must be taught its lesson. Lord Latham, a staunch Labour man, wrote nearly the same words in a newspaper interview. Both were reinforced by the Prime Minister's massive war statement of September 28, and by the Archbishop of York and the T.U.C. in October. So far so good. But how do we propose to fulfil these still vague pledges ?

What the French want for themselves is perfectly simple. They want what Foch demanded in 1919 and what we then refused : the frontier of the Rhine. They want, too, an equal place with the other principal Allies at the table where will be decided the practical measures for drawing Germany's teeth. They want these measures to be effective : Germany must not be left the chance to begin again twenty or thirty years hence. They want an equal part in the Allied occupation of German territory. For this end too they demanded complete recognition of General de Gaulle's Provisional Government, since the elections of a Constituent Assembly whence alone can spring a permanent government in France could not be held before the return from Germany of French prisoners of war and deportees, and it is clear that this will not be for a good while yet. France, as the country always most

menaced by Germany, is the party principally interested in the ultimate settlement. She is more interested even than ourselves, far more than the United States, and more than Germany's other main Continental opponent, Russia, which is in a better defensive position against Germany geographically and through States that will be subject to Russian influence politically too. France has the right to be satisfied.

It behoves us moreover, as the saying goes, to watch our step. Carping comment and insistence by certain war correspondents on superficial well-being in France and the ignoring of deep-seated want after the liberation of Paris did serious harm. Similarly with the political and social progress made since. We should remind ourselves that so terrific a storm as has passed over France cannot be calmed in a week or a month. We should rather marvel at the steadiness, the moderation, and the absence of vindictiveness shown by the French people as a whole. We owe them a confidence equal to that they feel in themselves. The practical steps taken in France promise well. The disruption of the French railway system as the result of Allied bombing, Resistance sabotage, and German demolition was almost total. Months were needed before trains could begin to run again, even spasmodically, from Paris to the provinces. Four thousand bridges alone were destroyed in France. This accentuated the food difficulty everywhere. Nevertheless Paris, whose larder the Germans had scraped bare, was better fed by October than during the occupation ; gas and electricity were beginning to come back by slow degrees ; and Frenchmen were getting 1,200 calories per diem in their food as against 800 six weeks earlier. This meant a deficiency of 800 calories when compared with our diet, still bad enough, but a great and rapid improvement. Happily France had a bumper harvest in 1944, in sharp contrast with our own. French herds are believed to have suffered less than was expected. At the same time the breeding of pigs has immensely increased in farms all over the country, the pig being an animal both hardy and relatively easy to conceal and so to save from requisition. We all rejoice at the signs of France's physical restoration. More comprehension doubtless is required to appraise those on the moral plane. One thing extremely hard for

us to understand is the isolation from and ignorance of the outer world in which Frenchmen found themselves on being freed from the Boche yoke. Progress is bound to be slow when men making it have to readjust their vision to the light. Then there are obstacles that cannot be quickly surmounted. Some enthusiastic well-wishers of France would have liked to see an immediate meeting of the Consultative Assembly ordained by the Provisional Government while still at Algiers on a wider scale than that which met in 'the White City.' But, since it was to contain representatives of liberated France, this could obviously not take place on the very morrow of liberation. There is further the question of local self-government. The *Conseils Généraux*, since they in turn elected Senators, have had greater political importance than our County Councils, and early elections to them is desirable in order to express the will of the country. Nevertheless, though these elections are on a narrower basis than the general election which can only follow the return of the prisoners of war, they cannot be held until fresh registers have been compiled, the more especially as the registers will for the first time in French history contain the names of women voters. Moreover, until railway communication was re-established how could candidates visit their prospective constituencies? Elections to the *Conseils Généraux* therefore could not be held before February 1945. Meanwhile the Consultative Assembly has been called into being and may later be enlarged. It met in November and contained an absolute majority of members of the Resistance movement, thus justifying the forecast made in this 'Review' in July 1944 that the Resistance would be the new broom in France. The re-organisation of French self-government has in fact been as rapid as the situation allowed. It is the more regular since M. Jeanneney, the former President of the Senate, has been serving in General de Gaulle's government from the moment of its arrival in Paris, and M. Albert Lebrun, President of the Republic in 1940, has given General de Gaulle his unstinted blessing. English people urgent for democracy to have full play in France must await that wished consummation with some patience and not indulge in silly talk about a 'semblance of democratic government' ('The Times,' Oct. 10, 1944); for this can only create bad feeling between ourselves and

the French, always a highly sensitive people and more so even than formerly as the natural result of the hideous trial from which they have just emerged.

These, it may be said, are small matters, susceptible of treatment by tact and good sense. So they are small indeed in comparison with the importance of the question put to us by the French and of our answer to it. In the long run there is for post-war Europe a choice between two systems only, if, that is, Europe is to escape a third German war of aggression which, should it be permitted, would almost infallibly spell the end of European civilisation. Lunar dreams of a 'federated Europe' or 'an United States of Europe,' sometimes indeed 'of the World,' are omitted from this calculation. To those whose feet are on earth there is possible, first, a West European front consisting of Great Britain and France acting in concert with Belgium, Holland, Spain, and Portugal, a renascent Italy perhaps joining in, if Italy should prove capable of respectable effort, and certainly constant sympathy, if not more, from the three Scandinavian countries. Much of the effect to be obtained from this could indeed be derived from a solid understanding between Britain and France alone; nevertheless for many reasons the more general agreement would be preferable. Such a conception for the maintenance of peace, it may be objected, cuts across the official plan which envisages a master combination of the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China. This latter combination however is extremely unlikely to prove lasting. No reason exists for supposing that, once the pressure exerted by Japan is removed, China will not slip back into the anarchy endemic since Sun Yat-sen's revolution; if it did not so slip back, China, or some part of it, would probably come out as successor to Japan with the militant slogan of 'Asia for the Asiatics.' And since neither Russia nor the United States, both on the watch for political and commercial predominance in China, could tolerate the one or the other with complacency, an early finis would be written to that grandiloquent scheme.

What need have we, it may be asked, for such a combination at all? If Germany is properly disarmed and the Nazi spirit exorcised, surely a remodelled League of Nations would be a sufficient safeguard for the future,

whether or no following obediently in the train of the latest Big Four? The answer is that Germany can be disarmed and kept disarmed and aggressive German ambition be mastered, only if there is real unity of purpose on the part of the other principal European nations vitally interested.

Otherwise—and here the second possible system comes into view—deprived of reliable British support France will be forced in self-defence to turn to the only other quarter whence support could be obtained, viz. Russia. Now, whatever our views may be on the Soviet structure of the State, it is obvious that Soviet and very likely any conceivable Russian interests in Europe do not march on all fours with those of the Western European powers. Even before the war has come to its end events in Poland, the Baltic provinces, and the Balkans testify to that. Not many years will pass after the war before we feel far more acutely the effect of this divergence of interest. Were France to be thrown back upon Russia as her only protection against a Germania rediviva, the position of Great Britain in Europe would be radically changed. Europe would become a sphere of Russian influence. England would virtually cease to be an European power. To prevent this depends solely on our own determination to back up France. Backing France must have; if she does not get it from us, she will get it from Russia, whatever this might cost her in the end. Even if the fashionable Dumbarton Oaks scheme ever gets into proper order, all this will remain just as true. Despite the studied slight on France in the absence of invitation to send a representative to Dumbarton Oaks, and the statement that she shall 'later' have a place on the projected Security Council, itself the result of the longer standing slight on France arising from the United States' malevolent refusal of recognition to the French Provisional Government, it probably will be got into working order, if merely to save the face of British and American theorists. Recognition of General de Gaulle's government has come at long last, and as it is well known that the obstruction did not come from Great Britain, we at least shall suffer less from the ill feeling left in its train. Still the slight on France will not be forgotten. It should serve as an illustration of the elementary fact that unity cannot be achieved merely by

crying aloud 'United Nations,' when it is plain to all that beyond the will and the necessity to beat Germany there exists no unity whatsoever, but only manifold discontents.

In order to change political realities it is not enough to rebaptise Geneva under the name of Dumbarton Oaks. And political realities come back to one unescapable fact. In order to prevent a third, and probably fatal, war caused by German ambition, unity of policy between Germany's victims is indispensable. Unity cannot be obtained by grandiose world-wide combinations of nations with divergent interests. It can be obtained only by a combination of those vitally interested to preserve their independence, that is to say, Great Britain and France, supported by the other Western powers. Even if Dumbarton Oaks should prove as startling a success as Geneva was a dire failure, a solid Anglo-French understanding would still be essential within its framework in order to produce effective results which, to be so, must have the duration of a generation at least, if not half a century. Great Britain and France are Europe's two Atlantic powers. Each is at the head of a great colonial empire. Those empires have now existed side by side for two generations without serious cause of discord between them. Great Britain and France must stand together, or there can be no peace in Europe. City and Sandhurst circles might well reflect that, whatever their prejudices, Frenchmen make less dangerous neighbours than Germans to have the other side of the Strait of Dover.

There is yet a third road open for developments in Europe. It is one that some acute French observers, while deplored the prospect, consider the most probable. In many parts of France the need of the moment is for order. This is felt especially by the peasants who form about 40 per cent. of the nation. If France were again, as in 1919, denied British support, the irritation caused by this, coupled with the desire for order, might produce a narrow and violent nationalism that would find its teammate in Spanish Falangism and, so far from helping to keep Germany under lock and key, serve as a hearth for a future international conflagration. That there are still quarters in France to which this would not be displeasing, renders this road the more dangerous.

It is easy now to see how our decision and our putting

it into practice must affect not only France's foreign but also her internal policy. Whatever view again we may take of the Soviet State, it is impossible to deny its militant quality. Not merely in the field of war but in that of politics too. Poland, the Balkans, or the Baltic States are there to teach us that. In France the history of the Communist party is notorious. Not content with sabotaging the French war effort in 1939-40 by ca-canny of every sort in the factories, its chief spokesman escaping from France to Russia, poured out wireless appeals from Moscow to French workmen not to work and not to fight. That suited Soviet policy of the moment. When Hitler attacked Russia, Soviet policy changed. For three years French Communists, free to remember that they were Frenchmen, joined in the valiant underground fight waged by all French patriots against the oppressor. In the Resistance movement politics lay in abeyance. But now that the victory is won and France is reconstituting herself, Communism reasserts itself in France as a separate force. Its dependence on Moscow once again becomes evident. Now Communism is not and could not be a genuine French creed. In a country where, as already remarked, some 40 per cent. of the population is composed of peasant proprietors and a high proportion beyond that of small property owning bourgeois and craftsmen, where, too, small concerns vastly outnumber the modern giants of industry, this could not be otherwise. The eighty Communist deputies in the Chamber were not elected by Communist votes but, while they refused all governmental responsibility, gained their seats and power through the wholly immoral political combination known, first, as the *Cartel des Gauches* and then as the *Front Populaire* casting in favour of Communist candidates the votes of Radicals and Socialists who at heart rejected the Communist creed. The result of Communists voting alone would have been a Communist representation of perhaps ten deputies.

No impartial observer can feel surprise or regret at the measures taken by General de Gaulle's government, to master the relatively small but positively powerful French industrial combines and to transfer their management to the hands of the nation. Although some of the biggest firms, such as Schneider, Michelin, and the French Ford

Company, behaved throughout the German occupation with exemplary patriotism, going to the length of self-sabotage, and even destruction of essential parts of their own works in order to embarrass the enemy, it is undeniable that the conduct of industrial France generally in 1939-40 and partially since then was lacking in wholesome vision and tended to set selfish interest above concern for the common weal. The question now of retribution is less one of industrial policy than of personal justice. French manufacture had to a large extent fallen into German hands; that was part of definite German policy. Usually the transfer was performed by the forced sale of shares for francs paid by Vichy to meet the expenses of the German occupation, so that Germany in reality paid nothing at all for them. Sometimes in the case of important concerns, such as the Kuhlmann chemical firm, the second of its kind in France with a capital of 150 million francs, by the issue to them in exchange of shares in German firms; in the Kuhlmann case in the Aniline and Potash combine. Such transactions can be rendered void, if it has not already been done by the time these lines are in print, by simply annulling all sales and purchases of shares in French companies since the armistice of June 1940, which measure will have the additional merit of torpedoing French speculators as well as German grabbers. Clearly the fact that certain companies like Renault and certain industries are in the process of nationalisation will extend the scope of state socialism in France. Our high priests of 'Socialism in our time' may do well to maintain a certain reserve in acclaiming the process in France. Viewed industrially it is by no means sure to be a vivid success. The French genius is eminently individual. Some enterprises already under State management in France hardly encourage an optimistic view, as witness the tobacco and match monopolies and the railways. France is bound in her special circumstances to extend the system, nevertheless the profit is likely to be political and social rather than commercial. It would not be surprising after a lapse of time conditioned by political conditions to see a reversion at least to individualist management in some nationalised or quasi-nationalised concerns. Attacks on those vaguely named affairs 'the trusts' may be offset by the discovery that trustification

is often coordination writ large, and that coordination spells economy. If the ideas advocated by the Resistance prevail, State Socialism may be replaced by a synthesis of liberalism and collectivism, called by Professor André Hauriou 'humanist socialism,' which envisages industry organised on a highly developed cooperative basis.

It is on the personal side that the assault on big business is of greater urgency. The *épuration*—the purging from French national life of the men who betrayed the nation—stood out even before the liberation as the nation's most burning demand. The problem has been tackled by the Provisional Government with wisdom. Purging committees were set up in every Ministry, profession, and factory to examine the case of men suspected of collaboration, for those alone who had been in close contact with them knew the facts and could distinguish between voluntary deeds amounting to adherence to the national enemy from others performed under duress or masking hidden opposition to him: especially when evidence was complicated by false denunciations of patriots by men implicated in abetting German policy who hoped thereby to turn the hunt away from themselves. Special courts with juries of four were constituted to try those against whom presumption was found by the committees. Men of the *milice* recruited by Darnand, Vichy's chief gangster, to fight against their fellow countrymen, were shot down or executed in the provinces by summary court-martial, but for the greater part even notorious collaborators were put on trial and could defend themselves. The sound policy was declared by the Provisional Government of striking at the heads of the collaboration but of treating with leniency small men who had been terrorised or forced by bread and butter necessity into acts of complicity. While graver charges stood against leaders like Flandin, Peyrouton, and Louis Renault, not to speak of Laval and Co., or of Pétain himself and the fifty-nine named as his consorts, most of the rank and file of collaborationists were brought under the charge of 'national indignity,' a new crime first promulgated at Algiers. This conception is admirable alike in its equity and its ingenuity. A charge of national indignity covers the whole ground of collaboration short of what in English eyes would be actual treason. As

under the basic English law of high treason, the crime lies not in the deed but in the will to comfort and abet the enemy in varying degrees : deeds are but overt acts testifying to the will. Those found guilty of national indignity, if servants of the State, are discharged without pension ; if members of trades or professions, are prohibited from following them again for a period of years or for ever. Nor can they ever again offer themselves for any public employment, and further suffer the loss of various attributes of ordinary citizenship. They become and remain outcasts. Rarely indeed has punishment been made so well to fit the crime. It still remained as late as November last to be seen whether the policy of *épuration* would be resolutely put into effect.

In the drive against collaborators the Communists have been active, but not more so than the rest of the nation. They are none the less interested in a different way. This again is a matter where Englishmen must exercise prudence. We nearly overstepped its bounds by a demonstration of puritan squeamishness over the shaved heads of women collaborators—all guilty, it may be noted, of that special form of collaboration known as 'horizontal.' If censorious Britons were to criticise French action against other classes of collaborators or the conduct of more important State trials, the consequences might be deplorable. To take specific cases, the sympathy shown here with Pucheu who, as any sincere inquirer could discover by consulting the French Penal Code, was doubly and perhaps trebly guilty of high treason, shocked all serious French minds. Similar sympathy with Flandin, by reason of his former hobnobbing at shooting parties with highly placed English people, or with Peyrouton, the Americans' protégé in North Africa, would now revolt the whole French people. So too would British sympathy with other Pétainistes, even when not guilty of active collaboration. Any such expressions would be powder and shot for the Communist party, whose precise object is to inveigle moderates to support Pétainiste ideas, in order to swing the bulk of the nation, which detests them, to extreme tendencies. Pétainiste ideas still exist. The Académie Française for instance has disgraced itself in the eyes of the nation by not striking Pétain's name off its rolls. If Great Britain can be represented as standing in

the way of French justice and as lukewarm in the support of France against Germany, an immense step will have been taken by Communism in its insidious drive for the mastery of France.

The Communist attitude has been receiving support from a somewhat unexpected quarter, viz. the old gang of French Parliamentarians who find themselves ousted from power under the Provisional regime. The Communists dreamed of controlling the Consultative Assembly which, though its word is not law, yet has great influence. Those old parliamentarians who were against Vichy, and refused their sanction to Pétain's *coup d'état*, in itself a laudable and courageous act, fancied that on the strength of it they should have the say-so in the Assembly. They forget or rather are incapable of comprehending that they represent the discordant forces whose factious impotence ruined France by making any strong government impossible. New France does not want a return to this at any price. So the old gang makes common cause with Communism in sapping the stability of the Provisional Government at the moment when stable government is France's essential need. Should the Socialists and the Radicals do now as they did when they combined with the Communists against Poincaré and Tardieu and when they took office with the Communists holding the reins in the wings, the situation might become awkward. Down to late in the autumn of 1944, however, the chances seemed rather to favour a competition between Socialists and Communists for the large floating mass of future electors with no fixed political views at present beyond a distrust of the Right and an insistent demand for a thorough purge.

The Consultative Assembly, critical as it is, and determined though it be to assert its authority, is none the less guided by leading ideas both patriotic and constructive. A combination between Communism and the old gang in the Consultative Assembly, and later even an electoral combination between Communism and Socialism, should the socialists show such suicidal silliness when it comes to the National or Constituent Assembly, is faced by the force of the new spirit in France, which is that of the Resistance. The men of the Resistance, in which the Communists certainly played a part but one they like to exaggerate—only one of the seventeen members of the

National Council of Resistance was a Communist—do not mean to go back to the bad old days of the ins and outs, when ‘a seat in Parliament,’ as M. Poincaré said nearly fifty years ago, ‘becomes an employment, a career, or a job,’ and ‘Socialism and syndicalism,’ according to M. Jacques Maritain ‘showed themselves capable only of squandering the vital forces of the Nation and aggravating its dissensions while at the same time ruining the hopes and energies of the working class movement.’ Nor do the men of the Resistance intend that France should be turned into a Soviet satrapy. It is here that the action of Great Britain may prove decisive. If we give France the support which will merely be the measure of our own sense of self-preservation in making another German assault impossible, and the sympathy in her management of her own affairs to which the conduct of French patriots within and without France thoroughly entitles them, there should be little fear of the sound democratic impulse that inspires the heart of France going off the rails. But should we fail in this, should nosey Parker fault-finding or mere officiousness poison our relations with the French, then evil influences would be only too ready to reassert themselves. In that case we should have to face the danger either of sheer anarchy or of a Sovietised or of a popular Falangist system across the Channel introduced under cover of the need for national protection. Fear of this happening has been partly responsible for pro-Pétain and anti-de Gaulle tendencies in America and England ; yet, should it happen, it is precisely they that will be responsible. Otherwise there is every hope of our seeing a revision of the French constitution that will eliminate the faults inherent in that of the Third Republic and provide in the Fourth a framework for the blossoming of all that is most noble and most promising in the traditions of the French nation. It is highly probable that among other changes a Federal basis may be introduced for the French empire as a whole. The bulk of the people of France has proved its moral unity during the past four years of abomination and tragic grandeur and, given a fair chance, will cleave its way through trouble and difficulty to prosperity, happiness, and great achievement.

Meanwhile it would be idle to minimise the troubles and the difficulties immediately ahead. They are those

unavoidable after so bitter a trial. Order must be fully restored. Transport must be reconstituted, and the question of order too depends largely on that of transport, for without rapid and continuous communication how can any central government carry out policy in provincial administration? Disorderly elements form an inevitable hangover from a secret and tremendous armed struggle. Much has already been done in France to overcome these difficulties: they will be wholly overcome. Then there is the gigantic ruin of the French ports and many other towns clamouring for reconstruction. There are financial difficulties. While prices increased between 300 and 400 per cent., wages and salaries did not advance in proportion, and the problem of satisfying demand for a sufficient scale of living while avoiding disastrous inflation does not admit an easy solution. A problem of longer duration is that of health and natality. Over 120,000 Frenchmen were shot by the Germans during the occupation. Over 100,000 were killed in battle in 1940; nearly 40,000 since then. A number as yet untold have died in prison and concentration camps. Nearly two million are prisoners of war or were deported to do slave labour in Germany; and who can yet say how many will return safe and sound? Fifty per cent. of French children show signs of tuberculosis, 35 per cent. of the fourteen-year-olds suffer from curvature of the spine. Before the war the proportion of deaths among all those taken to French hospitals was 3 per cent.; in 1944 it had risen to be 40 per cent. These facts speak but too eloquently of the long effort required of France to redress the balance and remake the wholesome nation of busy, well-liking families that was known to her friends barely five years ago. Great however as is the task, the French have the spirit to tackle it. They are a nation of workers. They have a great leader in General de Gaulle, whose genius was thrown up by the maelstrom of catastrophe, 'the only man to keep order,' as Cardinal Gerlier of Lyons has said. They have above all the inner flame of the men of the Resistance who braved death and, far worse than death, torture to save their country from slavery. These men have now the same determination to stick together and, having by their bounding force brought their country through the furnace of war, to make it shine triumphantly in the blessings of

peace. Their task is now to organise themselves into a political force on a practical programme. They are young France, the new France ; it is for them to make a new social and political Renaissance in France.

JOHN POLLOCK.

#### Art. 2.—THE CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TO THE WAR AND THE PEACE.

IT is not always easy to know how to apply Christian principles to the problems of war and peace ; yet it is necessary as a guide to our action, for a great deal of the misery of the world is caused by the failure to do so. We recognise how terrible has been the result of the repudiation of Christian morality by Germany, but there are those who tell us that we are really just as bad, and that the present war has arisen because we failed to behave like good Christians after the last war. Others tell us that it was our weakness and sentimentality that caused the failure. I would discuss then the question how we ought to treat Germany, supposing as we hope, our enemies are compelled to submit unconditionally.

What should be the Christian attitude to war ? We are told to love our enemies—we are told to turn the other cheek. Undoubtedly it seems easier for the Pacifist to obey the Sermon on the Mount than the soldier.

But a little thought will make us doubt this. In the first place, Pacifism does not seem to prevent wars, but rather to promote them. In the year 1933 the Oxford Union Society passed by a large majority a motion stating that they would not fight for their country. The newspapers, as is their way, advertised it throughout the world. It was a startling piece of news and harmonised with some of the tendencies of the day. Mussolini read it, and Ribbentrop read it. And it was looked upon as a sign of the degeneracy of this country. It was one of the direct causes of the war. No doubt if everyone were a Pacifist, there would be no wars ; but as long as there are aggressive nations, so long will they be prepared to use force

against their neighbours if they think their defence is weak and their spirit poor.

Let me pause and discuss another point : There is at present something of a cult of Youth ; we are told that the young who are to live in it are the right persons to decide what is to be the world of the future. They are more likely to be right. I am afraid that my experience does not make me accept that opinion. Youth is often quite wrong. National Socialism is largely a Youth Movement. I have met young Nazis and young Fascists who expounded their tenets with the most amazing confidence. We do not know yet whether the English youth at Oxford or the German youth will be most successful in destroying their country. As the English youth have failed to act in accordance with their folly, and the German youth have remained true to it, I have some hopes that the German youth may be successful in injuring their own people.

But to resume—Our Pacifists are very anxious that we should as soon as possible make a compromise peace. It is probable that Germany would welcome the offer. Have the Pacifists thought what it would mean ? The Germans are already saying quite openly that what they aim at is to prepare for another war. ‘We have lost this one,’ they say. ‘We have made mistakes. In fifteen years we shall have another war. We shall win that.’

The desire of the Pacifist is peace, but the result of his action is to make war certain.

Where does his error as a Christian lie ? He forgets that when we are fighting to defend our country, we are not fighting for ourselves but for others. Supposing I see a man murdering women and children, is it my duty as a Christian to pass by on the other side ? I hardly think so. It is my duty to prevent it, even at the risk of my own life, and even if it means taking his. That is not murder, and that is what a defensive war means. The Pacifist forgets the duty of sacrifice. ‘Greater love has no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friend.’ Every soldier who risks his life on the battlefield is a much better Christian than the Pacifist who claims to be so superior because he is ready to go to prison to avoid defending his country.

We may feel confident that it is the duty of a good Christian to be ready to fight in a good cause.

## 18 CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TO WAR AND PEACE

But now we come to another problem : If we win the war, what sort of peace should we impose upon Germany ?

There are those who, like Lord Vansittart, remind us that we must recognise the German mentality. It is not merely the Nazi mentality or that of the military clique. The passion of the German people is successful war, and war of conquest. They do not recognise the rights of any other peoples but themselves. They are destitute of any feelings of humanity towards their enemies. They despise those who are inclined to show them any kindness. They recognise no law but that of force. The only peace worth anything is one that leaves them quite powerless.

And then there are those who tell us that we must love our enemies. We imposed a hard peace upon Germany at the end of the last war. Would it not be a good thing for once to act as good Christians, and win them by kindness ?

Can we reconcile these directions ? What would Lord Vansittart have us do ? He would wish us so to treat Germany as to make it impossible for her to do once more what she has done three times. She must be deprived of army and navy and air force. She must be prevented as far as is possible from making munitions of war. She must be given such a constitution as will enable the peace-loving elements in the country to form her policy. She must be deprived of the support of the German minorities in other countries. Is there anything un-Christian in preventing a country from being aggressive ?

Then Justice must be done. Those who have been guilty of criminal actions must be punished. We know that something like 5,000,000 Jews have been murdered. We know that in Poland, in Russia, in Jugoslavia, in Greece, whole masses of the population—men, women, and children—have been butchered, often tortured first. We know that whole communities have been wiped out. The cruelty is greater than anything we read of in history. The perpetrators of these things ought to be punished. They should be solemnly tried. We do not want to imitate German methods ; but they should be punished.

The just resentment that a good man feels at the cruelties inflicted on others is the protection of society. The desire for such punishment is just. I do not think that here there is anything un-Christian.

Then thirdly—The Germans have inflicted terrible injuries on the countries that they have occupied, far greater than any military needs justified. They have pillaged them. They have destroyed whole cities. They have robbed them of the means of subsistence. They ought to be compelled as far as possible to make good these injuries. Is there anything un-Christian in that? I do not think so.

None of these things Lord Vansittart would have us do are un-Christian. But we are also told that we must continue to treat the Germans as a guilty nation, that we must not be friendly or associate with them, that we must go on punishing them. Surely that is wrong. When we have done these things, and while we are doing them, we should so far as possible treat them with courtesy and kindness. We do not want to imitate their manners or their brutality. We must see that the oppressed countries are fed, but we shall not do any good by starving the Germans. ‘If thine enemy hunger, feed him.’ We must help them to live a peaceful and well-ordered life. We must help to restore their cultural life. People talk about educating Germany. We cannot educate them unless we are prepared to associate with them in a pleasant way. Above all, we must strive to be reunited with them in their religious life. Of that I shall speak more fully later.

Pacifism is not a right representation of the Christian Spirit, and so far from preventing war is a cause of it. The only way of preventing war is to be ready for it. The motto for this country should be: ‘Be strong and just.’ We have the duty of defending our country. We are entrusted with the care of a great empire. If we had been sufficiently prepared we might have prevented Japanese aggression in Manchuria; we might have prevented Italian aggression in Abyssinia; we could have saved Czecho-Slovakia and Poland without a war.

Preparation for defence is not un-Christian. To be unable to defend our empire and assist our allies is wrong. But a good Christian knows that even in war he must show his Christianity, and the conventions of war are intended to carry that out. We do everything that is necessary to win the war, but there must be no needless cruelty. We do not fight against women and children. We treat the prisoner—the man who has submitted—with considera-

tion. We are ready to feed our enemies when the war is ended.

How then is Germany to be treated?

The problem is more difficult than some people seem to think. It is not merely the Nazi party that we are up against, it is the inherited German policy. Hitler came into power because he promised to do what Germany wanted. All the preparations for re-armament had already been made. I was in correspondence with members of the German Church, who might claim to be among the spiritual leaders of the country, right up to the outbreak of the war, and I could find no criticism of the policy of Hitler with regard to Austria or Czechoslovakia or Poland.

Bishop Marahrens is one of the most respected and influential leaders of the Church. Although not a member of the Confessional party, he was in sympathy with it. This is how he writes on June 30, 1941, when Hitler was starting on his campaign against Russia. The letter was also signed by Dr Schultz and D. Hymmen :

' My Führer, you have banished the Bolshevik danger at home and now summon the nations of Europe to the decisive test against the mortal foe of all order and occidental Christian civilisation. The German nation and all its Christian sections thank you for your deed. That British policy now openly accepts Bolshevism as an aid against the Reich, plainly shows that it does not stand for Christianity, but merely aims at the destruction of the German nation.

God Almighty may assist you and our Nation that we may defeat the double foe. All our purpose and all our actions must aim at that goal.

The German Evangelical Church remembers in this hour the Baltic Evangelical Martyrs of 1918, it remembers the unforgettable sufferings which Bolshevism would have caused all other nations, as it did those under its sway. All the prayers of the Evangelical Church remember you and our incomparable soldiers who are now engaged in destroying the pestilence, so that all Europe may experience a new order under your guidance, and that every spiritual decay, every defilement of all that is most sacred, every violation of the freedom of conscience may cease.'

This attitude, however, it must be stated, was by no means universal. The majority of the Pastors, so we are

informed, refrained from taking any part in supporting the crusade.

The Roman Catholic Church has throughout the war found itself in a difficult position. It resented, and rightly, Hitler's treatment of the Church, but it approved throughout of the foreign policy of the National Socialist party. It was by the votes of the Centre that Hitler came into power. The annexation of Austria was approved. In 1941 a letter of Dr Gröber, Archbishop of Freiburg, spoke of 'an honourable world peace,' which will give the Germans 'the necessary *Lebensraum* and their rightful influence in the world as a whole.'

In the same year Bishop Maximilian Keiller of Ermland wrote: 'It is just as faithful Christians fully convinced of God's love, that we resolutely take up our stand behind our Fuehrer who is shaping the fate of our people with a firm hand.'

In the same year, Bishop Balsowsky, of the German forces, wrote: 'Germany cannot forget what was done to her after the world war. The victors wanted to bury the Reich in the result of a hard peace. But it has happened otherwise. With the climax of the German Passion there dawned the Easter morning which, if God so wills, will emerge at the end of the war into the Easter aurora of resurrection for this people and nation.'

Each year the German Episcopate meeting at Fulda issued a Pastoral letter to the people, and it is remarked, and that by members of their own Church, that although the Governments' anti-Catholic policy was condemned, there was never any criticism of the conduct of the war, of the treatment of the Jews, of the Russian people and prisoners. In 1943, Sept. 23, they stated:

'On the ground-work of Christian faith and life the German nation has risen to the highest standard politically, economically, and culturally, that has ever been attained by any nation of the west.'

Too much stress must not be laid on the silence of many religious people. It must remain an acute problem whether a protest ought to be made, when it is quite certain it will have no effect, and will lead to the arrest of the protester by the Gestapo, and his confinement in a concentration camp. Probably the right course for most Pastors in such circumstances would be to pre-

serve a discreet silence, but tenaciously to carry on their religious life and teaching, and that, I think, many of them do.

To understand the German mentality we must realise first of all their fear of Bolshevism. This is a perfectly genuine fear and it is based on knowledge. The sentimental idea of Bolshevism which prevails among a certain number of people in this country who are deluded by a clever propaganda is not possible for those who have experienced its attacks. A leading German industrialist said after Hitler came into power, 'After all it is an advantage to know that we need no longer expect a gang of communists to come out from Essen and murder us.'

This fear of Bolshevism joins itself to the inherited German hatred of the Slav. The Slav is looked upon as the great enemy of the German people. The Slav might quite legitimately say the same of the German, for after all, his domain once stretched as far as the Elbe, and throughout the Middle Ages the Teutonic Knights carried on a perpetual war against him. At any rate the fact is that the German fears, despises, and hates his Slavonic neighbours. There are very few Germans who would feel that Poles or Russians had any rights that conflicted with German interests. They should be exterminated like vermin, and that is the way that the German has acted in this war.

Then the German is convinced of his own superiority as a race. He is the *Herrenvolk*. He is designed to be the conqueror and lord of the universe. His blood is different from that of other people. When he says that by the treaty of Versailles he was deprived of his just rights he does not mean that his freedom was taken away, but that he was not allowed to trample on other peoples, and in his occupation of Europe he has exhibited his ideas and methods. How galling must it be to a people with this belief that an inferior nation like the English should hold an Empire which extends throughout the world, or that a miserable country like Holland should have great Colonial possessions, while the German people are deprived of them. And how unfortunate that this nation of would-be imperialists should whenever they find themselves in power, show their complete unsuitability for rule. There is an element of brutality in the German which he has exhibited again and again. An inhabitant of one of the Baltic

countries said to me, ' I have known Germans all my life. If you let them, they will bully you. If you stand up to them and knock them down, they will be your very good friends.'

And then there is this problem of *Lebensraum*. Here we are up against one of the fundamental difficulties of the modern world. If not checked by war, or famine, or pestilence, the population of a country will increase faster than the means of subsistence. The Germans are a strong and fertile people. It was an increase of population which drove them across the Rhine in the days of Julius Cæsar, when he met the problem with Roman thoroughness. It is this same increase of population which drives them Eastwards against the Slavs.

This then is the problem. What policy must we pursue if Germany, as we hope, is decisively beaten. It is not a question merely of what we are to do with the Nazis. The Nazis only came into power because they were prepared to do what the great majority of Germans wanted.

There are two penal actions which, as I hold, are necessary, and from any Christian standpoint legitimate. The one is the administration of justice against those who have been guilty of crimes ; the other the reparation of damage inflicted in occupied countries, during the war. Justice must be delivered by a dignified and fair court. It must not be mere vengeance. The offence must be proved. The guilt must be clear. A record must be kept and published so that the people of Germany may know of what they have been guilty.

But how is Germany to be treated ? Are there to be any territorial changes. Clearly Austria must be restored to freedom. Bohemia must be restored to its historic boundaries. The West frontier of Poland must be carefully settled. There must be no appeal to a Plebiscite as during the years of war the Germans have been liquidating the Poles in these regions. We must be drastic with East Prussia. The arrangement of the Corridor, the position of Danzig as a free city, were efforts to make every reasonable concession to German feeling. With regard to Danzig, I have a special interest as the proposal to make it a free city was due to my brother, J. W. Headlam-Morley. The Germans made use of this and other concessions to inflict the maximum injury on the Poles. We cannot act like

## 24 CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TO WAR AND PEACE

that a second time. East Prussia was once Slavonic territory, taken by the Teutonic Knights. It must go to Poland and the Germans must make what arrangement they can for the evacuation of the German population. East Prussia must go to Poland. It is necessary to say that because the Russians who are hoping to annex the three Baltic States, are anxious also to annex Königsberg and the Eastern part of East Prussia. We must make it clear that we are fighting this war to enable Russia to gain her freedom and not to assist Russian aggression.

There is one matter of great importance. The Kiel Canal must be demilitarised and internationalised. I should be inclined also to give Denmark all Schleswig north of the Canal. Alsace-Lorraine will of course be restored to France.

Can Germany be divided ? The greatness of Germany was that of the old country, divided into many principalities, of the many states, great and small, in which the genius of the people found free play. The unification of the country has meant a steady decline in its well-being. I should like to see Bavaria and Saxony and Wurtemberg and Hanover restored, and many smaller states, and Prussia reduced to its proper size. I have no doubt that this would conduce to the happiness of the Germans, and the well-being of Europe ; but to put the clock back in this way, except with the cooperation of the Germans themselves, would not be possible. It can only be done if the people wish it. I have not, however, any doubt that the restoration of these countries and the re-establishment of their former rulers would be the best means of giving Germany well-being. Democracy leads inevitably to tyranny, and kings are better than tyrants.

We want to prevent Germany from being a military state. It has twice been attempted and each time it has failed. Napoleon reduced the Prussian army to small proportions. The Germans devised the short service system and when the time came there was a large disciplined army ready. It was tried again in 1918, and again failed. The size of German battleships was restricted ; so the pocket battleship was invented. We had the folly to agree to their building of submarines. As soon as the Treaty of Versailles was signed, the German General Staff began their plans for the next war and designs for tanks

and aeroplanes and armoured cars were ready when Hitler started mass production. If we win the war and peace is made, the Nazis will go underground and underground movements are very dangerous. It must be remembered too that efficient industry can very quickly be turned to military purposes. Apart from the possibility of secret factories, a small body of experts could have all their preparations made for the transformation to military purposes of the industry of Germany.

What then can be done? After the three great aggressions on Europe by the Germans, it is our duty to do what we can to make a repetition impossible. It is unnecessary for Germany to have a fleet, or submarines, or air force. A body of police to keep order is all the army she will need. She must be allowed no munition or aeroplane factories. It has already been explained why such measures may not be altogether successful.

Having taken these necessary precautions, it must be made clear that we do not desire to destroy the life or the prosperity of the country. If Germany is deprived of her means of defence, it will be necessary that she should be guaranteed against aggression. We must show that it is our desire that within her own boundaries, neither disturbing other people nor herself disturbed, she should live a peaceful and happy life; that she should give up her wild and lawless ambitions; that she should go back to her pursuit of learning, of literature, of art and science, in which she has conferred such benefits on the world, that she should join the peaceful unity of the Nations.

The war is being carried on by the allied forces of the British Empire, the United States, Soviet Russia, and China with the assistance now of the liberated nations. We have put forward as our principles the Atlantic Charter, which means that we desire for each nation in the way that it can best be attained, freedom and liberty to manage their own affairs within their own country, and that we are determined that justice shall be done for all countries. That means that this country and the British Empire must be strong and just, for I know no other guarantee for peace. We must strive to bind the nations together by a series of alliances. But do not let us deceive ourselves. We cannot arrange the future of the world. We have failed in the past. We fought the

Napoleonic war and made the peace of Vienna to make the world safe for monarchy. In thirty years the crowned heads of Europe were falling. We have had the same experience since the last war. We fought the war and made the peace of Versailles to make the world safe for democracy, and we established democracies throughout Europe. Before twenty years were out most of them had become tyrannies. We cannot rule the world. We can only do what seems best to meet the emergencies of the times. The future is not in our hands.

There is, I think, a more excellent way. Our politicians and statesmen and diplomatists will do their best to make a good and lasting peace, but we know how difficult is their task, and what failures there have been in the past. We cannot in that way change the hearts of men. We cannot get the lasting peace that we desire unless we can change the outlook of the German nation and the only power which I know can do that is the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

If we try to discover the ultimate causes of the terrible tragedies which have been going on around us, I believe that most influential of all is the fact that a large part of the civilised world has been faithless to our Christian heritage. I need not analyse the reasons—intellectual and others. It is the fact that is conspicuous. For many years France has been governed by anti-clericals who are mostly anti-Christian. There can be no doubt of the moral and political corruption of many of her politicians. The National Socialist regime has again and again repudiated Christian morality. Marxism as a creed is materialistic and anti-Christian. There are other widespread signs of indifference to the Christian Religion and therefore to the restraints of Christian morality.

The divisions of Christianity too, and the identification of Christianity with purely National interests may be largely to blame for this failure of Christian influence. Our ultimate hope for the regeneration of Europe must be a religious revival. Is that possible? I believe there are such possibilities. In 1930 we lost, I think, a great opportunity. One of the most influential and ablest religious leaders in Germany at that time was Professor Adolf Deissmann. He was a great scholar who used his scholarship for the support of the Christian Faith. He was a

deeply religious man who worked in every way for Christian Reunion. He had proposed and lost only by one vote a motion in the Berlin Consistory in favour of Episcopacy. When I last met him after the establishment of National Socialism he was a broken man. His hopes for his country had been destroyed. He seemed to avoid conversation. Shortly afterwards he died.

We had considerable evidence that an invitation to send a delegation to the Lambeth Conference of 1930 would be warmly received and that a distinguished body of men would have come. I believe that the reception of such a delegation and our conversations with it might have had great and important influence on the attitude of the whole Protestant world, and on the Spiritual future of Germany. I need not discuss the reasons why we missed the opportunity. I can only say that I regretted it at the time, and still feel how unfortunate it was.

Right up to the opening of the war, I had some contact with members of the German Church, for the most part with those not belonging to the Confessional group. Some who represented German Christianity in an extreme form were probably impossible, but there were many good and earnest Christians who were trying to reconcile their Christianity with a movement which might, they thought, mean much for the good of the German people, and which, if it had not had elements of evil in it from the beginning, might have developed differently to what it did. I learnt too that there were still many signs of Christian life among the people. But the German, more than any man, is capable of being mastered by a single idea, which he carries to its logical conclusion. Such an idea is 'total war.' It drives out all ideas of humanity, or morality, or religion. It masters, while it prevails, the whole people.

There were possibilities after the last war. There will be possibilities in the future. We are told by those who claim to know Germany that respect for the German Church has increased during the war. In many places there is said to be a strong Church life. Many party members are said to be tired of the new ideology. Church attendance is increasing. Effective Church membership is stronger than it was ten years ago. United Church leadership has on different occasions protested directly and indirectly against measures contrary to Christian

conceptions in national life, and in sermons, emphasis is laid on the validity of the Christian Moral Law in public life. There is a readiness, it is said, in Church circles, to recognise German war guilt ; but while aware of the nation's responsibility, Christians in Germany are convinced that other nations, by sins of omission and commission, also contributed to the creation of international chaos. Because of the deep-rooted fear of Communism and Pan-Slavism there is widespread disappointment in Christian circles that the Western Powers have not come forward with radical proposals concerning the solution of European social and international problems.

We must be ready to take advantage of the opportunities that will arise. We can do so by personal friendships, whenever that is possible. We can act when opportunity offers, with Christian Charity. If we have to speak the truth, let us speak the truth in love. We must be Christians ourselves and behave like Christians to our enemies. There will be openings. We must be ready to take advantage of them. For I am sure that nothing can bring peace and happiness to a distressed world but the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

A. C. GLOUCESTER.

#### Art. 3.—THE BANK OF ENGLAND AND BRETON WOODS.

1. *The Bank of England : A History.* By Sir John Clapham. 2 Vols. Cambridge University Press, 1944.
2. *The Bank of England from Within.* By W. Marston Acres. Oxford University Press, 1931.
3. *The Bank of England 1694–1944 : Its Buildings Past and Present.* By Reginald Saw. Harrap & Sons, 1944.
4. *United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference. Final Act.* [Cmd 6546.] H.M.S.O., 1944.

OF our national institutions not the least imposing, the least indispensable, nor the least characteristic is the Bank of England. Like the Constitutional Monarchy, like the Cabinet, like Parliament, and like the British

Empire, the Bank was, in origin, almost accidental, though in its developed form it is, like those institutions, the product of a prolonged process of evolution and adaptation to environment. To the Bank standing, through two and a half centuries, four square to all the tempests that have raged in the financial world, London owes the fact that it has long been the 'financial capital of the world.'

How many people really apprehend the meaning of this phrase so often on their lips? Why should the world have a 'financial capital'? And why should that capital be located in London: 'At its 250th birthday the Bank finds itself in the position of an all-but public body functioning as the sole banker of the Government of Great Britain, as the only note issuing authority in England and Wales, and as the central regulator of the British Banking system, and of the London money-market.' So 'The Times' wrote on July 27, 1944, the 250th birthday of the Bank. But that is far from being the whole story.

The primary functions of a Bank (let it be recalled in all simplicity) are to offer a safe place of deposit for money not immediately required by the owner, and from those deposits to make loans to accredited borrowers. In a word to transmute mere money into capital. Into a Bank there flow innumerable rivulets of *money*: out of it there issue streams, and sometimes broad rivers, of *capital* wherewith the industrial world is refreshed and fertilised. Of all the institutions established to perform these functions the most famous is the Bank of England. Its history has now been told—probably for all time—by Sir John Clapham. To describe his work only one word is adequate: it is monumental. These two portly volumes constitute, in truth, a monument of industrious and skilfully applied research which will give unmixed satisfaction to the staff and shareholders of the Bank and will prove indispensable to every serious student of English economic history. Sir John has not presumably enjoyed the advantage which, combined with rarely equalled powers of vivid and popular exposition, enabled Walter Bagehot to produce his classic, 'Lombard Street,' nor does his style possess the quality which has given to the work of Mr Hartley Withers its popular appeal. But Bagehot and Withers wrote essays: Sir John Clapham was commissioned to produce a 'History.' His aim has

been to tell the 'public and economic history' of the Bank 'with no more than a light background of general affairs.' The background is surely too light. As a consequence this 'lightness' has tended to make the present work a 'chronicle' rather than a 'history,' and the result of recurring statistical paragraphs is that the reader sometimes finds it difficult to see the wood for the trees.

Readers would, consequently, be well advised to prepare their digestions for the solid fare provided by Sir John Clapham by *hors d'oeuvres* Bagehot, Withers, and Saw. Mr Reginald Saw's 'The Bank of England 1694-1944, and its Buildings Past and Present' is to Sir John Clapham's as a yacht to a liner : it has 'but one aim : to tell in non-technical language a straightforward story of the Bank of England, and describe *such of its public offices as are open to the ordinary caller on business.*' Admirably is this modest purpose achieved. Intended for popular consumption the book is profusely and pertinently illustrated ; it also contains a useful Glossary, explaining such technical terms as Bank Rate, Fiduciary Issue, Gold Standard, Managed Currency, and the like. The narrative is conspicuous for lucidity, and (so far as I have tested it) for accuracy ; though I demur to the statement that the 'Treaty of Ryswick in 1697 brought to an end William III's feud with Louis XIV' ; nor do I understand why Philip V, King of Spain, should have been expected 'out of gratitude' 'to open the ports of his American Colonies' to English trade. But these are small matters, detracting little from the outstanding merits of a book evidently destined to popularity. Like Sir John Clapham, Mr Saw acknowledges a heavy debt to Mr W. M. Acres's 'The Bank of England from Within,' a work written by a former member of the Bank's staff, whose access to, and intimate knowledge of its records, has evidently been of incomparable advantage to both writers.

Nor has Sir John Clapham disdained to enrich his stately pages with a few reproductions of documents and numerous portraits. The documents reproduced are of great interest : The First Page of the First Cash Book (July 27, 1694), a plate illustrating the evolution of Exchequer Bills, and A Page from the Book of the Subscriptions (June 28, 1694). The 1,272 original subscribers included Godolphin and Montagu ; several peers ; some

members of Parliament, Esquires, and Gentlemen ; 'City Knights' and members of City Companies, and about 250 London business men of various grades. Of special interest is the considerable number of subscribers of Huguenot and Flemish origin, such as the Houblons and Janssens, as well as actual Dutch and Flemish foreigners. The portraits are (with one exception) of Governors. Nor could anything convey more vividly a sense of the strength, stability, and integrity of the institution over which they have presided than the portraits of these grave and truly reverend signors—the Burtons, Raikes, Mannings, Hubbards, Hollands, Lidderdales, and the like. The portraits (merely selective, of course) cover the period 1709 to 1892, and irresistibly suggest that such countenances were in themselves enough to inspire unlimited confidence among the customers of the Bank.

Plates and portraits are, of course, merely the adornments of a work that is unquestionably worthy, in the gravity and dignity of its style and structure, of the great institution whose history it records.

That England should have waited till the end of the seventeenth century for the establishment of the Bank will seem paradoxical only to those who are apt to antedate our commercial and industrial greatness. England had been in this respect anticipated by the Republic of Genoa and by the United Provinces. The Bank of St George at Genoa was about four hundred years old and was the natural concomitant of the industrial and commercial importance of the City-Republics of Italy. The Bank of Amsterdam, started early in the seventeenth century, indicated that pre-eminence in industry and commerce had passed to the towns of the Low Countries. But unlike the Banks of Genoa and Amsterdam, the Bank of England, though set up in 1694 to finance William III's war against Louis XIV, was not, and has never become, a State Bank.

The idea of the Bank proceeded from the fertile brain of a Scotsman, William Paterson, a city merchant and member of the Merchant Taylor's Company. Sponsored by Charles Montagu, a Commissioner of the Treasury, soon to become Chancellor of the Exchequer, Paterson's scheme was tacked on to the Ways and Means Bill of 1694, and became law as 5 and 6 William and Mary, c. 20. The scheme provided that in return for the loan of 1,200,000*l.*

advanced to the Government at 8 per cent. plus 4,000*l.* a year for management, the subscribers should be recognised as a Corporation under the title of 'The Governors and Company of the Bank of England' and authorised by a Royal Charter terminable, on repayment of the loan after a year's notice—but not before 1706. In the event the Charter was periodically renewed from 1707 to 1833, when notice to terminate it in 1845 was given. Before that date arrived a great piece of legislation had been placed by Sir Robert Peel upon the Statute-book. But this is to anticipate. By the original Charter of 1694 the Bank was forbidden (without the consent of Parliament) to lend to the Government or to borrow in excess of its capital, or to trade in any merchandise, but was allowed to deal in bills of exchange, in gold and silver bullion, or to sell any unredeemed pledges given as security for loans, and to circulate notes up to the value of its capital.

Despite the suspicions of the Tory squires, the Bank, strong in the support of the Whig merchants of the City, quickly established its position, under the shrewd management of a Governor, Deputy-Governor, and twenty-four Directors. All these were to be British-born or naturalised subjects, and to qualify respectively by subscriptions of 4,000*l.*, to 3,000*l.*, and (Directors) 2,000*l.*

That the stability of the Bank contributed not a little to the defeat of the Stuarts in the '15 and the '45 did not endear it to the Jacobites, while cementing its ties with the Whigs, who from 1714 onwards were in power for nearly half a century. But by the time that George III had broken the Whig party and established the Tories in office under his own leadership, the Bank had become in fact, though not in name, a State institution. So much so that in 1781 Lord North could without exaggeration declare that the Bank was 'from long habit and usage of many years a part of the constitution, doing all the business of the Exchequer with much greater advantage to the public than when it had formerly been done at the Exchequer.' 'All' is, comments Sir John Clapham, an exaggeration; but he adds: 'It made its annual contract to take Exchequer Bills. . . . It made advances on Land and malt, the two stablest taxes, advances which were paid off as the money was collected. It also made advances to subscribers to Government loans, to help

them to complete their subscriptions. It paid out dividends on the funds and handled transfers of stock. It was consulted when new loans or lotteries, or tontines were being arranged—and its officials were placed among the privileged first subscribers. There was still no rule binding Government departments to bank with it, but most departmental chiefs and other public authorities, together with many tax-receivers in the country had accounts in Threadneedle Street.'

Discounting, the purchase of bills of exchange, had long been practised in England, and it was always, as Clapham says, 'a principal way by which the Bank put its notes into circulation.' Very properly, therefore, he deals with the development of this side of its business in considerable detail.

The Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars (1793–1815) naturally involved great anxiety and activity at the Bank. Hardly had the war started when the Bank raised with Pitt the question of government borrowings which might be held to be illegal under the original Charter. The Bank was forbidden 'to lend money to government upon Funds not having Loan of Credits'—in plainer language except upon the security of regular Parliamentary votes. The custom had, however, grown up for the Bank to advance money on Treasury Bills of Exchange payable at the Bank. Questioning the legality of this custom the Bank asked Pitt for an Act indemnifying it for any irregularities in the past and authorising it, under limits, to continue such advances. Pitt agreed; and in May 1793 an Act was passed which not only relieved the conscience of the Bank but put into Pitt's hands a financial weapon of which in the difficult days ahead he made ample use.

The same year was marked by a commercial crisis, far more serious than any of those which in the course of the eighteenth century had periodically preceded it. The 'main causes' of the crisis of 1793 were in the authoritative judgment of Thomas Tooke, 'pre-existing in a great and undue extension of the system of credit and paper circulation.' The industrial and agrarian revolutions of the eighteenth century had brought into being a large number of private provincial banks, which, if not consisting of more than six partners, could issue their own notes.

Exact information is lacking but about a dozen such banks are believed to have existed in 1750 ; by the early nineties the number was nearer 300, of which one hundred failed during the crisis of 1793. But by 1804 the number had again increased to 470–80, and by 1810 there were no fewer than 783 private banks licensed to issue notes, on which stamp duty had to be paid.

Meanwhile there had occurred in 1797 a most serious crisis in the history of the Bank. The drain upon the Bank's specie resources had since 1793 been so severe that in May 1797 Parliament intervened and by Statute forbade the Bank to make cash payments ; its notes were made legal tender, and though an attempt to get back to gold was made—vainly—in 1811, the suspension of cash payments continued to the end of the war. After 1818 the controversy between the adherents of 'Gold' and 'Paper' became so acute that Sydney Smith complained wittily that he got nothing in town but 'soup and bullion.' In 1819, however, a Committee was appointed to decide the matter. Presided over by Peel, it recommended that cash payments should be resumed not later than 1823, but so strong was the position of the Bank that they were in fact resumed on May 1, 1821.

Peel was also responsible for the very important proposals embodied in the Bank Charter Act of 1844. Based upon the 'currency' principle, the Act required that the circulation of banknotes should be limited to the amount of bullion in the hands of the bank. It separated the Banking from the Issue Department of the Bank and placed the latter under stringent regulations : the Bank might issue notes up to 14,000,000*l.* against securities, but no more except against bullion, 75 per cent. of which was to be gold. The Act also forbade any Private or Joint-Stock Bank established after 1844 to issue notes at all, and severely restricted the note issue of the older Banks. Thenceforward the issue of 'Country' banknotes gradually diminished, chiefly owing to the absorption of Private into Joint-Stock Banks, though it did not entirely cease until 1921.\*

The policy of Peel and of Jones-Lloyd (Lord Overstone), who was believed to have inspired the Act of 1844,

---

\* Cf. Saw, p. 57.

has been frequently criticised, chiefly on the ground that in times of crisis when the Act should specially have operated it was found necessary to suspend it. In actual practice it has been suspended only once—during the ‘America’ Crisis of 1857. In the Railway Crisis of 1845, the Overend and Gurney failure in 1866, and on the outbreak of war in 1914 though the Bank obtained permission to suspend the Act it did not in fact exceed its statutory issue of banknotes.

Sir John Clapham’s formal narrative ends with the outbreak of the War in 1914, though he adds a short epilogue on ‘the Bank as it is,’ pointing out, incidentally, that the Bank in 1944 is farther from 1914, than 1914 was from 1714. Two great wars; the return to the Gold Standard in 1925, and its abandonment in 1931; the assignment to the Bank (in 1928) of the entire management of the currency note issue, the vast extension of the ‘Fiduciary issue’ and the tacit acceptance of a ‘managed currency’—all these matters will demand detached exposition when the time comes for writing the history of this period.

Interesting, however, as is Sir John Clapham’s history of the Bank, public attention is at the moment concentrated less upon a municipal institution than upon international finance and commerce. More and more clearly is the truth apprehended that the peoples of different nations are, indeed, members one of another. ‘Sirs ye are brethren.’ That is pre-eminently true in the financial and economic context. As a result it is deemed necessary to devise new and very elaborate machinery for giving effect to these truths, and for reaffirming some primary and fundamental axioms, the significance of which has in practice been obscured by international jealousy and by the erection of barriers, designed for protection but mutually inimical to prosperity.

To most people problems of international finance and trade are difficult if not incomprehensible. It may help to comprehension if we keep steadily in mind certain elementary truths. Lending and borrowing are primitive transactions among men—long anterior to banks. To lend is a Divine injunction, though only on condition that no mutual advantage accrues from the transaction. Exchange is also a primitive instinct. The youngest

schoolboy learns to calculate the terms on which so many marbles can be 'swopped' for so much chocolate. Self-sufficiency may be a national ideal, but by few people outside the ranks of savages is it actually achieved. That it is neither possible nor desirable to achieve it are indeed the underlying assumptions of the elaborate series of recommendations made in the Report of the Bretton Woods Conference.

That Report, by a happy coincidence, appeared almost simultaneously with the celebration of the birthday of the Bank of England. The problems considered at Bretton Woods are closely intertwined, though not identical, with those which the Bank exists to solve. In the highly developed form in which they perplex the world to-day, they are profound mysteries. The paragraphs that follow represent the painful efforts of an amateur to penetrate, and, in the simplest terms, explain them.

Forty-four Governments,\* representing States ranging in size and importance from the United States to Panama, met at Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, from July 1 to July 22, 1944, to confer upon International Monetary and Financial Problems. Their conclusions, unanimously reached, have now been embodied in a *Final Act* for the consideration of the Governments and peoples they represented.

The single purpose of the scheme may be described broadly as nothing less than the economic rehabilitation of the world. This is to be achieved in two ways : (1) by the establishment of an *International Monetary Fund*; and (2) the establishment of an *International Bank for Reconstruction and Development*. Of the two parts of the Bretton Woods scheme the Bank is, as many people think, the sounder; it is certainly the simpler, and for that reason I begin with it.

The total subscribed capital of the Bank is to be at the outset, 9,100 millions of dollars, or £2,275,000,000. This is to be contributed by the forty-four United Nations in shares proportionate to their assumed wealth. Thus the U.S.A. is to subscribe 3,175 million dollars, the British Commonwealth, including India, 2,375, Soviet Russia 1,200; Iceland and others are to subscribe only one

---

\* The Argentine Republic was the most notable non-adherent.

million dollars, while four still poorer States are to contribute only a fraction of one million.

Following banking practice only 20 per cent. of the capital is, at first, to be called up; the residue is to be subject to call; liability is to be limited to the uncalled capital. Shares may not be pledged or encumbered in any way and will be transferable only to the Bank. Any member may withdraw from the Bank, but shall remain liable for its obligations to the Bank and for its contingent liabilities incurred up to the moment of withdrawal; or any member may, for given reasons, be suspended: in particular a member shall be automatically suspended on ceasing to be a member of the International Monetary Fund. The government of the Bank is to be vested in a Board of Governors consisting of one Governor and one substitute appointed by each member; but direction will virtually be exercised (with few specified exceptions) by twelve Executive Directors, of whom seven are to be elected by ballot, each member having 250 votes plus one additional vote for each share of stock held. The remaining five directors are to be appointed by the five largest shareholders. The Executive Directors are to select a President who shall not be either a Governor or an Executive Director, shall have only a casting vote on the Executive Board, but shall conduct all the ordinary business of the bank.

In addition, the Governors are to appoint an Advisory Council of not fewer than seven persons, representatives of banking, commercial, industrial, labour, and agricultural interests and 'with a wide and national representation as possible.' This Council, meeting annually or as often as the Bank may request, is to advise the Bank on matters of general policy.

The Bank is to assist in the reconstruction and development of the countries represented by its members, after the manner approved for the development of domestic trade and industry by English Joint-Stock Banks.

The Head Office of the Bank is to be located 'in the territory of the member holding the greatest number of shares,' with agencies or branch offices in the territory of any other member.

It might have been expected that an international character would have been given to the Bank as to the

Hague Court by its location in the capital of one of the smaller European Powers. It was decided otherwise. Located in New York, with the United States in possession of a vast preponderance of voting power, how can the 'International Bank' fail to secure banking hegemony to America? It may, indeed, be objected that such hegemony has already passed to New York; but it is difficult to believe that the Bretton Woods scheme will, in respect of this and other points, receive the endorsement of the British Parliament without substantial amendment.

Criticism is, however, likely to concentrate itself less on the International Bank scheme than on the International Monetary Fund. Bank and Fund are, indeed, closely interlocked. The same forty-four states are members of both bodies; their 'quotas' are almost, though not quite, the same; to both the contribution of the United States is immensely preponderant—even more to the Bank than to the Fund; the regulations for the management of the two institutions are almost identical. The principal offices of both will be in the United States; above all, suspension of membership of the Bank will normally automatically follow upon cessation from membership of the Fund. Finally, both are designed to promote international trade, and thereby contribute to the maintenance of a high level of employment and 'real income,' and the development of the resources of all members.

Among the main obstacles to the achievement of these objects have in the past been the variations in the international values of national currencies and the imposition of foreign exchange restrictions. Of these terms a simple explanation is perhaps permissible. Trade between two different countries, as between individuals, may be carried on by barter or through the medium of an accepted currency. The schoolboy bargains to exchange three marbles for an apple, or perhaps fifty for a pocket knife. The more sophisticated savage will exchange a kid for so many shells, knowing that he can in turn exchange shells for feathers. Shells are for him a measure of value and a medium of exchange. For both purposes civilised peoples have generally adopted the precious metals, partly because their relative scarcity makes them

'precious,' partly because they are convenient to handle, and not least because they possess 'intrinsic value'—i.e. because they can be employed for purposes other than exchange.

Complications begin when trade becomes 'international'—in itself a somewhat misleading term. Except in States under a totalitarian regime trade is not between nations, but between the nationals of different countries. Such trade can, of course, be conducted through the medium of money. But two obstacles immediately obtrude themselves: first, to transfer coin is precarious and costly; and secondly, it is uncertain at any given moment how many francs or dollars—for instance—a sovereign will purchase. Consequently, foreign trade is in fact mostly carried on not by money but by 'bills of exchange.' An English tobacco-nist purchases tobacco from Virginia by buying a 'bill' in London. He may have to give 5*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.* for a 5*l.* bill; or he may get it for 4*l.* 15*s.* The price of the bill on New York will depend upon the aggregate of transactions between England and the U.S.A., upon the balance of payment which will have ultimately to be made in coin or specie.

The main object of the International Monetary Fund is to remove, as far as possible, the obstacles that prevent free exchange of *goods* between one country and another—obstacles due partly to physical difficulties, partly to the policy of governments. Most governments have found it convenient to raise a greater or less proportion of their revenue by duties imposed upon imports, or more rarely upon exports; all countries make a profit on their currencies, ranging from a comparatively small profit in gold, silver, or copper coinage up to nearly a 100 per cent. on 'paper' money. Some countries also impose 'foreign exchange restrictions.'

Such restrictions it is a main purpose of the Fund to eliminate; to 'promote exchange stability, to maintain orderly exchange arrangements among members, and to avoid competitive exchange depreciation.' In view of the dislocation of trade caused by varieties of currency and by the bewildering changes in their relative values the Fund is also designed to 'assist in the establishment of a multi-lateral system of payments in respect of current transactions' and thus to 'shorten the duration and lessen the

degree of disequilibrium in the international balances of payments of members.'

The means of achieving these purposes is to be provided out of the 'Quotas' subscribed in vastly differing but precisely prescribed amounts by all States adhering to the Plan. Of the total subscription of 18,800 million dollars (2,200,000,000*l.*), the quota of the U.S.A., for example, is fixed at 2,750 million dollars; that of the United Kingdom (the next largest) at 1,300 millions, that of Liberia and Panama at less than one million. Out of the Fund thus created a member is to be supplied, at its own request, with the currency of another member in exchange for gold, or for the currency of the member desiring to make the purchase. To such an operation the Fund will (except in certain specified cases) be limited (Art. V, Section II). Transactions between the Fund and its members must in every case be conducted through the Treasury, central bank, stabilisation fund, or other similar fiscal agency of the several States. Individuals will not have access to the Fund, the head office of which is to be located in the United States. Another significant provision will further contribute to the monetary hegemony of that country. By Article IV, Section I(a), 'the par value of the currency of each member shall be expressed in terms of gold and a common denominator or in terms of the United States dollar.' That this does not technically involve a restoration of the gold standard may be argued.\* But leaving aside the question whether a restoration of the gold standard is or is not desirable in itself, it can scarcely be denied that this provision must redound to the advantage of the country which possesses so large a proportion of the world's gold.

This is by no means, however, the only criticism evoked by the Bretton Woods scheme.

The first question that arises is whether the scope of the scheme is so severely limited as Lord Keynes has insisted? If so, does not the scheme fail to offer a solution for the larger problem it had admittedly to face? 'The Bretton Woods proposals,' said Lord Keynes ('The Times,' August 29, 1944) 'are concerned solely with currency and exchange and not with commercial policy.' Speaking of

---

\* As by Sir John Anderson at the Mansion House on Oct. 4.

his own plan he had previously said : ' It is not a Red Cross philanthropic scheme by which the rich countries come to the help of the poor. It is a highly necessary piece of business machinery.' But if this limiting interpretation be correct, people naturally ask : what has become of the avowed end of the Monetary Fund quoted above (Art. I) ? ' To that end,' Lord Keynes would probably retort, ' currency stability and free convertibility are essential means. The Fund will supply the means.' Will the Monetary Fund prove adequate even to perform that limited function ?

That it will do something towards it may be fairly conceded, but the facilities provided are, in fact, less than those suggested in the original Keynes Plan.

A further question anxiously asked in this country is about the reaction of the Monetary Fund upon employment at home. Undeniably unemployment has in the past been partly, perhaps largely, due to deflationary methods adopted by our trade competitors. Does the new scheme offer adequate safeguards against the recurrence of that danger ? Until that question can be answered with an unequivocal affirmative, a final judgment on the scheme will certainly be suspended, and endorsement of it withheld.

Business men are also concerned to know whether the Plan precludes regional or bilateral commercial agreements. Take an example suggested by a special correspondent of ' The Times.' Great Britain concludes an agreement with Australia for the purchase of 70,000,000*l.* of wheat, and Australia, in return, agrees to spend the 70,000,000*l.* only in Great Britain. Is such an arrangement consistent with the Plan ? Lord Keynes (August 23) answered ' yes ' and further suggested that the most effective way of carrying out such agreements would be to supply the country taking British exports with a certificate entitling the holder to export an equivalent amount of goods to this country. ' Equally, there is nothing,' he said, ' to prevent other countries from requiring us to take their imports as a condition of receiving our exports. But he significantly added that forms of commercial policy, permissible under the Bretton Woods proposal, may nevertheless be very foolish ; and if generally or widely adopted would render those proposals ' rather a waste of time.'

Nevertheless there will be much sympathy with the view of another correspondent of 'The Times.' 'We must take steps to ensure that those nations who desire to sell their goods in our great market shall be paid in sterling only convertible, directly or indirectly, into British goods and services not in sterling which (owing to free convertibility) can be used as a counter in international speculation, and which being freely convertible into gold parity currencies, may cause of necessity the adoption here of deflationary policies, thereby wrecking all our plans and hopes of post-war reconstruction and leading to a somewhat similar state of affairs as occurred between 1921-1931.' This is undoubtedly the voice of reason, experience, and common sense. It must not go unheeded.

Further criticisms will doubtless suggest themselves as the Plan is more and more closely studied. Even its underlying assumptions that it is possible to separate financial and commercial issues, or to consider either in isolation from domestic economic policy, may well be challenged. And there are other debatable points. Such, for instance, is the question as to the size and allocation of 'quotas,' which determine also voting rights, and so in fact the control of the Fund.

The Article (IX) dealing with the status of the Fund and the immunities and privileges of its representatives in the territories of each member will also demand the closest scrutiny. Nor can the constituent members be expected to submit to such searching investigation into every detail of their economic position as appears to be involved in the acceptance of Article VII, Section V. Many will complain that acceptance means the complete surrender of financial freedom; while the alternative, refusal, may well involve a disastrous boycott. The dilemma is, to say the least, disagreeable.

That so large a measure of agreement on matters so difficult and delicate was reached is, however, a matter of sincere congratulation. The scheme has still indeed to run the gauntlet of debate in the member-States; but, whatever the final issue, the 'Plan' constitutes a remarkable achievement, the fruit of patience and skill expended in the interests of world-peace and world-prosperity.

To revert in a concluding paragraph to the great

institution of whose history in the past Sir John Clapham has furnished a record so entirely worthy and satisfying. It were vain to ignore the fact that the Bank is to-day the object (in some quarters) of sustained and virulent hostility. We must needs, therefore, beware of those glib victims of a fashionable slogan, who, in envy or ignorance, would 'nationalise' one of the most 'national' of our institutions. What these people really want is that the Government of the day should have unrestricted control over currency and the facilities afforded by credit. Everyone knows that during the last thirty years the relations between the Government and the Bank have become more intimate than ever, although those relations, despite much frank revelation by Sir John Clapham, remain admittedly mysterious. All that the public knows for certain is that there is laid upon the Treasury an obligation to justify, in the eyes of a body of men, of high intelligence, immense experience, perfect integrity, and detached judgment, its demands upon the Bank. This obligation is as reasonable in itself as it is invaluable to a Government, necessarily influenced as it must often be by mere party considerations, just as it is a clear advantage for Ministers of the Crown to be constrained to justify to a Sovereign, detached from party, the legislative proposals or executive action of his 'servants.' Occasional inconvenience may perhaps arise from methods so characteristic of our polity. But the proof of the pudding has been in the eating. This country is, for obvious reasons, in a peculiarly delicate not to say precarious situation as regards its economic life; yet the ship of State, if sometimes tempest-tossed and battered, has never yet failed to reach port. How far it owes its safety to the fine seamanship and unruffled temper of the men on the bridge is a question which the industry of Sir John Clapham has gone far to answer.

J. A. R. MARRIOTT.

*P.S.*—The Report of the F.B.I. published on Nov. 28 strikingly confirms the view expressed in the foregoing article. The F.B.I. (as summarised in 'The Times') insists that the Monetary Fund and the International Bank would not alone suffice to attain objectives of vital concern to the United Kingdom.

## Art. 4.—AN EARLY VICTORIAN DIARY.

To turn from the study of papers relating to a paternal ancestress, Harriet, Lady Bessborough, of Regency fame, to those of a maternal grandmother, Lady Charlotte Guest,\* whose early activities took place at the beginning of the Victoria era, brings home to one forcibly the remarkable change that, within so short a period of time, came over the English scene.

In 1812, when Lady Bessborough was at the height of her correspondence relating to the Whig world, in the year that is marred in her calendar by the date when her daughter Caroline first met Byron, Lady Charlotte Bertie, later to take the stage at the rise of the curtain on the Industrial Age, was ushered into the world.

The lives of these two ladies, so different in other respects, were similar in one point. Their stories are recorded for posterity in each case as a result of the labours of their own untiring pens ; Lady Bessborough's by her correspondence, of which much has already been published, and Lady Charlotte's by her journal, which has not yet seen the light of day, but which she kept without interruption from the age of ten until she was seventy-seven years old, when she had become almost completely blind. A bare recital of her accomplishments may be enough to establish the claim that she was a remarkable woman.

As a girl she had learnt not only French and Italian, but had embarked on the study of Greek, Latin, Hebrew, and Persian, and was a skilful etcher on copperplate. After her marriage to John Guest, when they went to live in South Wales, at Dowlais, where his ironworks † were situated, and where most of her ten children were born, she started learning Welsh, and became such a mistress of it, that she was able to publish her translation of the 'Mabinogion,' the Welsh tales of King Arthur's Round Table, upon which Tennyson founded 'The Idylls of the King.'

---

\* Lady Charlotte Bertie, daughter of the 9th Earl of Lindsey, born 1812, married firstly 1833 Josiah John Guest, M.P. for Merthyr, who was created a Baronet in 1838 and died 1852; and married secondly 1855 Charles Schrieber, M.P. for Poole (who died 1884). She died 1895.

† Now part of the Guest, Keen and Nettlefold combine.

For a number of years she acted as confidential secretary to her husband, and kept the accounts of the iron-works. 'All the reports from the works go through me now,' she notes on one occasion. These labours often kept her occupied late into the night after a long day of other activities. When forty or fifty letters arrived by the post, her work in dealing with them would produce no further comment than 'busy morning.' Her strength, she said, seemed to increase in proportion to the number of things she had to do.

On occasion, in her husband's absence, she was entrusted with negotiations for the sale of rails. She became so highly skilled in business that she claimed it was more congenial to her 'to calculate the advantage of half per cent. commission than to go to the finest ball in the world.' None the less she became an experienced hostess and eventually entertained on the grand scale at her husband's London house in Spring Gardens.

When he bought the Canford Estate in Dorset, she personally supervised the many structural alterations in the house and changes in the park, which were made under the guidance of Sir Charles Barry, who was engaged at that time in building the present Houses of Parliament. Lady Charlotte also chose the many works of art that went to adorn Canford.

In addition to her literary, business, artistic, and social activities, she found time for open-air pursuits, rode on horseback at Dowlais, and occasionally handled a gun when her husband was shooting at Sully, a place by the sea near Cardiff, to which they resorted from Dowlais for rest and recreation.

Meantime she was actively engaged in bringing up her ten children, to all of whom she was a devoted mother.

For several years after her husband's death in 1852 she bore on her shoulders the sole responsibility for the management of Dowlais. It was more than ten years after her second marriage in 1855 to Charles Schreiber, that she started to buy china all over Europe, and became the first and later the most famous of amateur collectors. She also included fans and playing cards in her 'chasses.' These collections are to be found in the British and Victoria and Albert Museums.

A remarkable memory was one of Lady Charlotte's  
Vol. 283.—No. 563.

characteristics. The writer remembers her quoting Chaucer at length when she was over eighty years old.

This brief summary of Lady Charlotte's multifarious accomplishments and activities is given to justify the further elaboration, provided in this article, of her career during the period of her first marriage. She first met her future husband in the spring of 1833 at a party given by Mrs Wyndham Lewis,\* whose husband, a Member of Parliament, was John Guest's partner at Dowlais. A few months later the marriage took place. Thus at the age of twenty-one she took, what was, having regard to the social conventions of the time, the extraordinary step of marrying a man 'in trade.' She, who described herself as of the best blood in England, deliberately espoused an ironmaster from Wales, a dissenter and a man a great deal older than herself. It was some years before surprised and even horrified London society opened its door to them, and accepted hospitality at their house in London. As a girl Lady Charlotte had been far from happy at home. Her mother had married 'en secondes noces' a cousin, the Rev. Peter Pegus, a disagreeable man of violent temper, who exercised undue influence over Lady Charlotte's two brothers, who, unlike herself, were of weak intellect. Years later she wondered how she could have lived through all the sorrow and refined persecution of her young days, and that she did not either go mad or run away.

This unhappy childhood accounts for her writing, nine years after her marriage, on the subject of social engagements :

' I always feel so solitary at all these gay things. I am shy and proud (or rather from extreme sensitiveness I seem so) and almost all the people I am acquainted with appear, as it were, strangers to me. A great deal of it is owing to me not having lived amongst them young. . . . For myself I have occupation and resource enough never to feel dependent on society for amusement.'

And a few days later she says :

' Though my husband is peculiarly formed to shine and rise, and is infinitely more elegant than half of the lordlings I

---

\* Who married Disraeli as her second husband.

meet, and though I have my own rank, which is high enough to assist me, the consciousness frequently obtrudes itself that in this aristocratic nation the word trade conveys a taint . . . I am determined to overcome the prejudice. . . . For myself I care not . . . but the children shall never feel that there live any on earth who do, or who dare look down on them.'

But, as has been indicated, her marriage to a man in trade was not the only prejudice that Lady Charlotte had to overcome before she could push open the doors of society, for when she had succeeded in doing so, she recorded :

' I have striven hard to place myself in the situation of life in which I was born, and from which my Mother's unfortunate (second) marriage so long excluded me, and now I really believe I have accomplished it and need not henceforth toil through pleasures for the sake of society. My children now, I hope and believe, will have none of those struggles, to make which I have felt so much humiliated.'

The extent to which she overcame prejudice is proved by the descriptions she gives of her many brilliant dinners, concerts, and balls at Spring Gardens, where she entertained lavishly, received members of the Royal Family, the leading statesmen of the day and their wives, and all the rank and fashion of London.

It may also have been for the sake of her children that she encouraged her husband to buy Canford, to employ Barry to adapt it, inside and out, to her desires, and to furnish it sumptuously as a suitable frame for the family in the position it had attained.

Though not fond of society Lady Charlotte undoubtedly attracted admiration from members of the male sex. That she made the marriage she did was a matter of choice. In spite of her constant expressions of humility and self-depreciation, she was an essentially strong character, with a determination to make a big position and to fill it in a big way, as the wife of the man who became 'the largest manufacturer in the world.'

The earlier years of her married life were certainly years of effort, not without discouragement and disappointment. Under a mask of extreme reticence she was not only very sentimental, but highly emotional. Tears were ever close to the surface. She frequently

indulged in paroxysms of weeping in the secrecy of her room, or pacing the garden alone.

She was devoted to her husband, but appears to have had some difficulty at times to play the part that a great ironmaster in those days expected of his wife. Though she was extremely loyal, even when writing for her own eyes alone, and always reproached herself when blamed in connection with what were in effect secretarial services, the reader of her diary cannot avoid forming the opinion that her husband was on occasion an exacting taskmaster.

Her feat, in the midst of a very full life, in translating the '*Mabinogion*', which involved, not only a complete mastery of the Welsh language, but of the early mediaeval text in which these tales were written, as well as an immense amount of research, is an example of pertinacity and power of concentration as well as intelligence, which alone could have made possible an achievement, which, Mr Lloyd George once told the writer, must be regarded as very remarkable for any English man or woman to have performed.

This great task, commenced in 1838, took her eight years to accomplish. At the end of it she commented, though quite unnecessarily in her case : ' If a woman is to do her duty as a wife and mother, the less she meddles with pen and ink the Better.' The '*Mabinogion*' was not Lady Charlotte's only literary effort, for she wrote a book on the history of the iron trade, as well as pamphlets on technical iron processes. She was nothing if not versatile. The translation of the '*Mabinogion*' was printed while it was being written, and after its completion in 1846 was published in three volumes.

It was the first book that Tennyson bought after his marriage, and thus it came about that his '*Idylls of the King*' were based upon it. This led to his becoming, and remaining all his life, a friend of the family. Soon after publication the '*Mabinogion*' was translated into French and German. Eighty years later Mr Rhys Phillips, the Librarian at Swansea, wrote :

' With a dominant will and exemplary fidelity Lady Charlotte pursued her self-imposed task for a period of eight years—working at it while touring the Continent in 1838 ; amid the distractions of her work as one of the heads of the Dowlais works ; even during periods of child-bed in 1838 and

1839. Is there anything like it on record? Translation apart, the voluminous notes appended to each story bespeak a range of knowledge and a breadth of scholarship, English, Welsh, and Continental, which mark her out as one of the most remarkable women of that Victorian age.'

He regarded her work as epoch making, and as inaugurating a new era of Romance study both here, on the Continent, and in the United States of America.

The Guests went to live at Dowlais very soon after they were married. Lady Charlotte quickly became enamoured of the life there. She rapidly developed an intense interest in the conduct of the great iron works, which she visited every day and where 7,000 people were employed, but she also soon fell in love with Wales and the Welsh people. Looking back on her life there she wrote, years later, of her adopted country :

' And oh, how I have loved it with its dear warm-heartedness. All Saxon as I am, my own countrymen chill my shyness into pride. But the dear Welsh, with their ready smile and never failing welcome, make me feel amongst them as another being, exalted myself, yet not equal to them, in courtesy and love.'

Writing of the view from the top of Cefn Merthyr, after an afternoon 'ramble,' she says :

' We commanded all the wild country about my dear home with the picturesque fires of its many furnaces. The sugar-loaf in Monmouthshire, the whole vale of Taff, the mountains at the head of the Neath Valley, the majestic Beacons, the silvery line of the Severn sea, and beyond it the distant, shadowy hills of England.'

The calm of the busy routine of life at Dowlais was from time to time changed into excitement by such events as contested Parliamentary elections at Merthyr, John Guest's constituency, and even by Chartist riots, which, though they never seriously affected Dowlais, caused a great deal of anxiety.

The Guests' long periods of residence at their home in Wales were frequently interrupted by hurried visits to London during the Parliamentary session and for business and other purposes both there and elsewhere. In spite of the long and exhausting days of travelling involved, Lady Charlotte constantly accompanied her husband on

these journeys, but she also very often remained alone at Dowlais, though only for short periods, and was obliged to deal with any situation that arose at the works during her husband's enforced absences on urgent business.

Though they were for a great part of the year at Dowlais, the Guests spent considerable periods in London during the season and while Parliament was sitting. They first lived in Grosvenor Square, but in 1840 they bought the lease of the Duke of Bedford's house in Spring Gardens. This purchase caused a great deal of talk, and the time of its occurrence no doubt coincided with the height of Sir John Guest's prestige in the business world, perhaps of his fortune, and the general acknowledgment of their by now established position in the social world. Two years previously a milestone had already been passed when, on the recommendation of Lord Melbourne, John Guest received a baronetcy, which, however, his wife considered should certainly have been a peerage.

It is significant that in 1839, in the interval between the two happenings just related, when Sir John set up a new and commodious London Office in Lothbury, a room in it was specially fitted out for Lady Charlotte's use.

This signal compliment to her, as her husband's partner in business as in life, led to a note of triumph in her journal, unique in all the many volumes that go to make it up. Not merely unique, it was the exact opposite of countless expressions of self-depreciation to which she gave vent. It may be that the compliment itself was without parallel.

' . . . whatever I undertake I must reach eminence in. I cannot endure anything in a second grade. I am happy to see we are the head of the Iron trade, otherwise I could not take pride in my house in the City and my works at Dowlais, and glory (playfully) in being (in some sort) a tradeswoman. Then again, my blood is of the noblest and most princely in the Kingdom, and if I go into Society, it must be the very best and first. I can brook no other. If I occupy myself in writing, my book must be splendidly got up and must be, as far at least as decoration and typography are concerned, at the head of literature, and I delight in the contrast of musty antiquarian researches and the brilliant fêtes and plodding counting house, from all of which I seem to derive equal amusement.'

While Sir John was a regular attendant in the House of Commons, Lady Charlotte, though taking a great interest in politics, and especially in the fortunes of the Whig party, seldom listened to debates. In 1842 for the first time she went to the opening of Parliament.

' . . . my place was a very good one, just in front of the throne in the gallery above the bar to which the Commons are called, but unluckily I had to stand the whole time, which was a great fatigue to me. The King of Prussia came in some time before the Queen. His appearance is not very prepossessing. He is a stout, rather coarse looking person as far as at that distance I could judge. The Queen looked ill and not in the best humour. The Commons kept her waiting for some few minutes, and she appeared very impatient, playing with her fingers on the arm of her chair of state. She smiled once which was at the King of Prussia. I was quite surprised at the clearness and self-possession with which she read her speech. . . . While waiting (in the House) for the carriage to come within hail, the doors were all at once closed and the Chaplain suddenly began reading prayers. The hum of voices immediately ceased, and we all fell on our knees to join in the most beautiful and impressive prayer that was offered up, including a petition that the Peers might be influenced by no private interests in their deliberations and the passing of their laws, which on the eve of a Corn Law debate seemed to me inconsistent enough to say the least of it. The Queen's speech was an admirable one, and would have fitted a Whig better than a Tory administration. . . . The Queen was received badly—almost without a cheer.'

In 1846 Sir John bought Canford of Lord de Mauley \* for 330,000*l.*, after protracted and even harassing negotiations, which lasted for a year. Lord de Mauley's second son Ashley Ponsonby had to be made a party to the sale, and being a minor the consent of the Court of Chancery was required, and in addition an Act of Parliament had to be passed before the sale could be completed.

Amongst Lady Charlotte's early preoccupations at Canford were the proceedings of Mr Walter Ponsonby,†

\* Hon. William Ponsonby, third son of the 3rd Earl of Bessborough, born 1787, married Lady Barbara Ashley Cooper, daughter of the 5th Earl of Shaftesbury, was created Lord de Mauley 1888, and died 1855.

† The Hon. and Rev. W. Ponsonby, later 7th Earl of Bessborough, had been appointed to the Canford living by his uncle Lord de Mauley. Twenty-five years after the episode here related, Mr Ponsonby's eldest son Edward, later 8th Earl of Bessborough, married Lady Charlotte's youngest daughter Blanche.

the rector of the parish. Within a month of settling in, early in 1846, she notes: 'From things I have observed here I am half afraid that Puseyism has mingled its pernicious leaven with the purity of the Gospel even here.' Later she speaks of a service at which all present were said to be shocked by a print of a crucifix flanked by two candlesticks. 'It has grieved me,' writes Lady Charlotte, 'I cannot say how deeply. The more so as I fear I can do nothing to rescue our people from the contamination of witnessing practices which must tend to break down the feeling against Popery.' Recourse to Church at Wimborne produced no relief. 'Alas, where may a good Protestant now find sound doctrine with fervent piety?' She decided to consult the Archbishop of Canterbury. Tait duly received her at Lambeth Palace, sympathised with her scruples, but feared 'that there was nothing he could take hold of to stop Mr Ponsonby in his career.' When, on her return to Canford, the delinquent pressed her to say to what she objected in his conduct of the service, Lady Charlotte appears to have been astonished to find the 'popish' rector as mild and gentlemanlike as possible. 'He spoke too in a most Christianlike spirit and with a humility that was quite painful to me.'

The state of public feeling on Church matters at this time is exemplified by another entry in the journal. In November 1850 Lady Charlotte notes that at the conclusion of a concert at the Opera House, when 'God save the Queen' was sung, 'the enthusiasm and sensation of the audience was beyond anything I could have imagined in quiet business like London. . . . The great indignation felt at the Papal bull promulgated, dividing England into Popish Bishoprics and sending a Cardinal to reign over them, will account for much of this burst of loyalty.'

Later Lady Charlotte received another and even more severe shock. Sir John had lent Dowlais House for a few months to his nephew Edward Hutchins who had a small share in the business. The Guests were unexpectedly obliged to go from Canford to a meeting at Merthyr, and were to stay the night with Hutchins and his wife. Shortly before this visit Lady Charlotte heard that the new Roman Catholic Bishop of Merthyr was expected at Dowlais House on a visit. She was quite clear that she 'could not meet this man' on her own ground and at her children's birth-

place. So the morning after their arrival at Dowlais Sir John spoke to his nephew, 'who, as well as his wife, was very violent.' Here was mortification indeed! To be flouted, in one's own house, by a nephew 'who a few short years ago was penniless.' When the Bishop arrived in the evening, Lady Charlotte lay down in her room and decided not to go down to dinner. But still further mortification was in store. 'Merthyr (as she always called her husband) attaching less importance to the whole matter than myself, though deeply wounded at the part the Hutchins had taken, thought it best to go through the form of dining with them, and did so. I think I never felt so deserted. . . . It was the bitterest moment of my whole life.' Next morning after a cold cup of tea in her room she went out for the day and returned to her room in the evening. But the following morning 'a fresh vexation occurred.' She went down to breakfast believing the Bishop had gone out. She was scarcely seated when he entered the room and sat down. Lady Charlotte promptly left her breakfast and the room, 'in intense agitation.' Breakfastless she sallied forth for the day's engagements and only returned in the afternoon to break her fast on cold meat alone with Sir John. She was prepared to go out for the evening when she learnt that the Bishop had left suddenly by the midday train.

Sir John's business being now concluded they themselves left Dowlais the next day, having 'parted kindly' with Mrs Hutchins, but without seeing her husband, 'and so this melancholy and memorable visit came to an end.'

Lady Charlotte gives some account of the great Exhibition of 1851.

The Guests first visited the Crystal Palace on the eve of the opening. 'Some affirmed the whole edifice would tumble down—some that the noise of the cannons would shatter the glass . . . and not a few expected that riots and rebellions and conspiracies were suddenly to break out. . . .'

Lady Charlotte describes how the morrow belied these gloomy anticipations :

'As the clock struck twelve the Queen issued from the waiting room which had been prepared for her, and accompanied by Prince Albert and the two eldest children, proceeded to her place amidst the uncontrolled enthusiasm of the multi-

tudes of people. . . . All this pomp and panoply were called together to do honour to the industry of millions, whose toils, erst scorned upon, seemed suddenly ennobled. It was a proud moment for our Queen of England! While the nations of the earth were convulsed, she has called into existence this peaceful meeting, the most gigantic ever known. . . . As the wife of the largest manufacturer in the world, I could not but feel this to be a most impressive sight.'

Something of the responsibility of this position is exemplified by an entry a few weeks later: 'An envoy from Dowlais reported that one of our rails had broken on the new Railway in Russia. This is a most serious matter. The Russians are our best customers. . . .'

A month later Lady Charlotte notes: 'Kitson is starting for Russia to be present at the official opening by the Emperor of the line between St Petersburgh and Moscow. . . .' Sir John longed to go himself, so did his wife, but his health had already begun to fail, and that made it impossible. So their normal routine went on. She went to a party that night given by Lady Palmerston.

A few weeks later they were back at Dowlais hard at work, and as usual receiving visitors to see the works, who on this occasion included the old King of Oude, the Prussian Minister of Commerce, and another Prussian, Scottish by birth, who was engaged on Government works in Silesia. Meantime important orders for rails were continuing to come from Russia and Spain. Such orders from abroad are always faithfully recorded in Lady Charlotte's diary, and show that in addition to the countries just mentioned, rails went in large quantities from Dowlais to France, Holland, Germany, Poland, and the United States. A reference to negotiations in which Sir John was concerned for the building of a railroad from Paris to Calais produces the following comment: 'The intrigues and jobbing even amongst the most respectable class of French placemen must be atrocious, diverting to see for a time, but disgusting in the extreme when no longer curious as a novelty.'

The rapidity with which the railways spread over this country is shown by the fact that in 1833 when the Guests were married they drove from London to Dowlais with horses, whereas ten years later, while the French were discussing a railway from Paris to Calais in the manner

described, the Guests went all the way to Dowlais in one day, by train except for passage by boat from Bristol to Cardiff. Lady Charlotte constantly went to Brighton for the day from London, to visit her children who were often sent there for sea air. In 1845 she speaks of this railway journey taking an hour and a half. She also frequently went by train to Canford and back in the day to inspect improvements or to pay the children a flying visit.

When the General Election of July 1852 occurred, the Guests were at Canford, and Sir John, on account of the state of his health, was invited not to appear on the hustings at Merthyr, and was assured that he should be returned without any trouble. He accordingly remained at Canford and was returned unopposed in his absence.

Negotiations for the renewal of the lease of Dowlais from Lord Bute which had started eleven years previously were at this time causing the Guests much anxiety. Sir John was now disposed to accept Lord Bute's terms so long disputed, and prepare to wind up the works in 1856.

When, in November 1852, the lease was brought to Dowlais for Sir John to sign he was on his deathbed and unable to do so. While anxiously watching by his bedside Lady Charlotte despatched two of their boys to London to see the Duke of Wellington's funeral.

'The impression of all this great ceremony is, I find, that, except the display of troops and their order of march and the funeral car, there was nothing good. All else was paltry upholsterer's work. Disraeli's funeral oration on the Duke is found to be a bad translation of one of M. Thiers' over Marshal St Cyr, and great is the derision he has incurred in consequence. How could he be so absurd? It is odd to myself how I can go on with worldly matters when I am on the point of parting with my soul's partner—my (almost) idol for nineteen years.'

Sir John died a few days later.

The two extracts from the diary which follow, both written within two months of his death, which had left Lady Charlotte desolate, are each typical of her in their own way.

*Dowlais, Jan. 14, 1853 :*

' . . . Evans returned Friday, in which night I got uneasy about the speed at which No. 1 Engine has been going (20 strokes per minute) and in the middle of the night [I] sent to

have it rectified. She has been blowing all the old side (eight) furnaces, and five Refineries, unassisted, and has done it well.'

*Canford, Jan. 18, 1853 :*

' . . . The open carriage met us at Wimborne, and soon we were at Canford. . . . I could see but little in driving in, but the alterations seemed improvements. When we stopped at the door, I got out silently and leaving them all went straight to the library, where luckily there was a light. A slight veil had been thrown over his bust, which at once I removed, and then I flung my arms around it, and remained clasping it for some minutes, kissing the cold lips—not colder than his own when I kissed them last—and shedding torrents of passionate tears—and this cold marble is now all that is left to me.'

As has already been mentioned, Lady Charlotte, for several years after her husband's death, as his executrix and trustee, was in charge of the Works at Dowlais.

In the Summer of 1853 a strike developed in South Wales in which Dowlais was involved. In the many conferences amongst the masters, and in negotiations with the men at Dowlais, Lady Charlotte, a lonely woman amongst so many men, played her part with calmness, courage, and resolution.

Two years later the chapter of her life as Lady Charlotte Guest closed, and on her marriage to Charles Schreiber a different one opened, in which she eventually found new and other activities to take the place of those which had come to an end.

Readers whose interest in Lady Charlotte Guest may have been aroused by this sketch, will find the doings of Lady Charlotte Schreiber described, mainly in connection with her famous collection of china, in the pages of her published journals, 'Notes Ceramic,' edited by her son Montague Guest.

She died at Canford in her eighty-third year in 1895.

BESSBOROUGH.

## Art. 5.—INDIA IN 1944.

1. *Hansard* : Lords, Oct. 20, 1943, July 25, 1944 ; Commons, Nov. 4, 1943, July 28, 1944.
2. *The Asiatic Review*. January, April, July, October. East India Association.
3. *The Royal Central Asian Journal*. January, May, July, October, 1944.
4. *The Future of India*. By Sir Reginald Coupland. Oxford University Press.
5. *India's Fateful Hour*. By Sir William Barton. John Murray, 1942.
6. *Sir Louis Stuart's Indian News Sheets*. January to October 1944.
7. *The Round Table*. September 1944.

A PAPER read by Sir Alfred Watson to the East India Association on April 29 on the question 'If Britain quit India' moved Bishop Eyre Chatterton to address a letter to the 'Indian Church Magazine' which contains the sentence : 'Now that we are drawing near to vast political changes in our relations to India—where so many of us have served and for whose welfare we must always have the deepest regard—might we not set ourselves to think how we can in any way help India in the coming days and how each of us can do this ?' In the 'Quarterly Review' of January and October 1941, October 1942, April 1943, January 1944 I have endeavoured to be of some little assistance by tracing the course of Indian politics from the beginning of the present war up to the end of Lord Linlithgow's Viceroyalty. Through the kindness of the Editor I am now attempting a sixth article which will carry on the review into the first year of Lord Wavell's administration. I left India as long ago as May 1919 after thirty-five years' service, but I have followed her fortunes ever since with unfailing interest.

Lord Wavell arrived in India on Oct. 18, 1943, took over the Viceroyalty at Delhi on October 20, and then proceeded to Calcutta where he arrived on October 26, anxious to see and hear all that was to be learnt about affairs in Bengal and Assam, which from both military and economic points of view claimed his urgent attention. In the 'Asiatic Review' for January and April and the

' Royal Central Asian Journal ' for May last are articles and recorded discussions which shed a flood of light on the affairs of those two provinces and owe much to the contributions of Sir Robert Reid, who in May 1942 retired from the Governorship of Assam and has since acted as Governor of Bengal. He points out how the North-Eastern frontier of India has for the present taken the place of the North-West as the side of danger (having until very lately been regarded as of far less strategic importance) ; how when the Japanese began to invade Burma, Assam became a base for military operations both ways ; a stream of Indian refugees began to flow northwards from Burma, and military operations had to be carried on most vigorously. Then Lord Linlithgow commissioned Major-General Wood with the widest possible powers to deal with all matters respecting communications. Transport was the first consideration whether the word meant roads, railways, 'buses, wagons, or anything else. The principal arteries of trade in those parts are the rivers. Water transport largely conveys goods and travellers, and there is a very efficient river service which normally affords communications all the way from Calcutta up to Sadiya in the north-east corner of Assam. A substantial number of steamers and flats had already been carried off for use in other theatres of war before Japan came in ; and the local system rendered magnificent service in bringing down sick and wounded beside discharging all its normal functions as a distributor of tea and other produce. The railway system of Assam is narrow gauge and single line. On the north bank of the Brahmaputra where it runs right athwart the whole watershed and close to the hills it is peculiarly vulnerable to flood damage. Immense difficulty was experienced on this account in 1942 and it was supplemented by the malign activities of Congress saboteurs. Did space permit I would refer to other points in Reid's paper, which show what the heavy and continuous rain which the refugees from Burma who traversed the Hukawng valley road-route had to endure. The tale of all the difficulties and hardships to which these poor people were subjected was a heavy one. 'The people of Assam,' Reid says, 'in the hill country round the borders offered their services freely from the start of the war. The women, especially those of the hill tribes, had come

forward in a wonderful way to work as nurses. When the Auxiliary Nursing Service was started in 1941 they showed their worth. They are particularly good at that sort of work.' Of a notable tribe, the Nagas, he tells us : ' We went into their country first as a measure of protection for our own people in the plains from head-hunting raids. Then from protecting the people in the plains we inevitably protected the people of the hills and thereby transferred the responsibility of defence from their shoulders to our own. Kohima—a well-known name now—became the headquarters of a district. The Nagas have shown themselves thoroughly loyal in the war. They furnished thousands of young men for road or transport work.'

Speaking on Oct. 5, 1943 on General Molesworth's very instructive paper regarding ' India's part in the four years' war,' Reid paid a remarkable tribute to the Indian Tea Association and the Assam Oil Company. ' Labour,' he said, ' was in many respects the key to the problem (how best to assist the Government) and the tea industry could obtain thousands of coolies in the tea districts and could also find more men in the districts whence that labour came. It obtained men in thousands and provided the supervision staff, the medical staff, and its own supplies. The debt owed to the tea industry was a very heavy one indeed.' He spoke also of the ' highly efficient Assam Oil Company ' and the Abor Labour corps. His paper on Assam in the January 1944 ' Asiatic ' is most instructive.

Bengal has suffered from a combination of trials ; the basis had been the general panic and feeling of insecurity arising from the approach of the war. Then there had been the Midnapur cyclone and the realisation that no rice would come from Burma. In the coastal districts internal transport (boats, motor vehicles, transport generally) suffered badly wherever the devastations of the cyclone extended. Even bullock carts were unavailable as most of the cattle had been killed by the raging storm.

Under the Constitution of 1935 Agriculture, Food, and Education had been included in the provincial field of administration and legally could not be invaded by the Central Government. But on the outbreak of the war by special legislation the Centre was empowered to override

autonomous provincial government in the legislative and executive fields should the security of India be threatened. But this special provision could hardly be resorted to without machinery or a trained staff, which were both lacking. So the Central Government adopted the expedient of holding conferences with the representatives of provincial governments and states—procedure which occasioned disputes and delays, while landless labourers, destitute villagers, professional beggars, drifted fast into Calcutta. This immigration, as Mr Amery said, was mainly responsible for 'the heartrending scenes of suffering that have so deeply disquieted us here.' Helped by the officiating Governor, Sir Thomas Rutherford, the Bengal Muslim Government struggled with the situation, and when Lord Wavell arrived about 2,000,000 people were daily receiving free issues of food. A rationing scheme for Calcutta was in preparation. But it was already evident that organisation must cover the whole of the province.

Lord Wavell lost no time. Unattended by any retinue and without even a police guard, he saw all he could, including sleepers on pavements and scattered destitutes. He put an end to disputes between provincial governments and the Central food department regarding quotas of surplus grain to be spared to Bengal. He inspected hospitals, kitchens, and relief centres. He visited parts of the Midnapur district, the most afflicted area. He arranged at once for supplies and detachments of the military forces to assist in relief, for medical aid by Army doctors, and for transport of food to outlying tracts and additional administrative control. On Oct. 11, 1943, 'The Times' had reported that the interplay of political and communal interests and intrigues had led to serious running down of the administration—'personal malevolence misinterprets and opposes measures of relief.' The Government of Bengal in a long statement on November 6 had drawn attention to the efforts of designing people who by spreading lies discrediting the efforts of the authorities were trying to keep destitutes on the streets of Calcutta in order to serve political ends. Something like a campaign to prevent acceptance of currency notes was reported from the districts, the object being to weaken the Ministry and undermine the Central Government. A

large rice surplus yield, however, was now expected and was shortly realised. Prices had begun to fall, and the fall was accentuated by the relief measures pushed on by Lord Wavell. The officers of the Agriculture Department had for some time worked hard to improve seeds and methods, but their numbers were inadequate, and funds were insufficient. All these matters are now, as we shall see, being investigated by a committee of experts. The responsibilities of local and central governments had been closely debated in the Commons on Nov. 4, 1943, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had been once a famous Governor of Bengal, had argued that they should be judged calmly. The inflationary spiral of prices had very largely contributed to the hold-up of supplies which was one of the main causes of the present situation. He had also shown how closely appeals for shipping from the Indian Government to London had been and would have to be geared to the general war effort. But the Home Government were putting into India by the end of 1943 all the grain that they could.

In January 1944 Mr R. G. Casey, the new Governor, formerly in the Middle East, arrived in Calcutta and took charge in Bengal. By February 17, when Lord Wavell addressed the Legislative bodies at Delhi, he had visited seven main provinces and two of the states under ruling chiefs. He had looked at towns and villages and spoken to many people. His hopeful and very active energy was proving a tonic, and his endeavours to get all possible help from the Army met with the cordial cooperation of the Commander-in-Chief. In addressing the central legislative bodies he said that on his tour he had realised more vividly than ever how much of India is countryside, how many live in villages, how comparatively few in towns. Everywhere he had been impressed by the work which was being done for the benefit of the country by officials and non-officials. The post-war world would be for India a world of the greatest opportunities and great dangers, in which she had an outstanding role to play. Their part was to use rightly and to the best advantage her great economic assets—not to increase the wealth of the few but to raise the many from poverty to a decent standard of comfort. The development of India was being dealt with by a committee of his Executive Council, which had now

reached the stage at which—for certain subjects at least, as for example the demobilisation and re-settlement of soldiers—definite plans could begin with some detail. At present it was more difficult to plan India's political future. He could state what he knew to be the point of view of practically the whole British people. They desired to see India a prosperous country, a united country, enjoying complete and unqualified self-government as a willing partner in the British Commonwealth. 'My first task,' he said, 'is to assist the South-East Command (under Lord Louis Mountbatten) to drive the enemy from the gates of India. . . . Food, too, is an all-India problem which the Government is trying to organise on an all-India basis. Key points in the plan are the strict supervision of dealers, avoidance of competitive buying on the procurement of government requirements, statutory price control, control over movements, and rationing in the larger towns. We are not out of the wood yet, but backed by substantial imports, I believe that the food position will improve greatly in 1944. Conditions in Bengal have improved and I trust they will continue to improve. We must run no risk of last year's disaster being repeated. The food problem is closely linked with the inflationary threat which we are determined to avert.' He also referred to the continued detention of Mr Gandhi and some of his followers (a subject on which the Home Member of Council, Sir Reginald Maxwell, had spoken on February 7 at some length, tracing briefly the war record of the Congress party up to the passing of the Resolution of August 8, 1942 which sanctioned the starting of 'an open rebellion launched with Mr Gandhi's words "do or die"'). There was nothing to show that there was now any change of heart in the Congress leaders, yet their release was frequently demanded in the Hindu Press. This demand, now said the Viceroy, was utterly barren unless some sign appeared of willingness on their part to cooperate. If they felt that they could not take part in the present government they might assist in considering future problems. But he saw no reason to release the men responsible for the Declaration of August 8, 1942 unless he was satisfied that the lines of non-cooperation and even of obstruction had been withdrawn 'in recognition of their barren and impracticable policy.' Regarding the Hindu

and Muslim political dispute he would merely observe that India was 'a natural unit.' History has shown that two communities and even nations can arrange to live together. His military training had convinced him that an objective was not gained without the fullest measure of cooperation from all concerned.

Neither the Congress nor the League Press approved of these downright utterances. Mr Jinnah, addressing the Muslim League at Aligarh, characterised the reference to the unity of India 'as bitter and provocative'—which it certainly was not. A 'Nationalist' Muslim conference met at Delhi, and, though comparatively a small body, declared that Pakistan was detrimental to the country. Mr M. N. Roy, leader of the 'National Democrats,' a new party, said that His Excellency's speech 'made a definite break with the tragic policy of appeasement which attached unduly great importance to a noisy minority and left the masses of the people wholly out of the picture.' On March 23, Dr Khare, Overseas Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, speaking on the Finance Bill in the Central Assembly, effectively defended his Indian colleagues from Congress attacks, pointing out that through India's war-effort and the action of its Government a country which was a debtor country had become, or was fast becoming, a creditor. She had made great progress in industrial development. She had also been militarised and could show more than 2,000,000 persons knowing how to bear arms and trained in all sorts of modern warfare.\* No one could deny its significance. 'The cry for Swaraj is useless unless you can defend your own country.' This war had also necessitated giving technical training to about 200,000 youths of India, which will be of use in the post-war period. 'That knowledge will not be lost. Besides, there has been the expansion of markets, and we are trying our best to go from poverty to prosperity. We may succeed or fail. Judge us by that.' The speaker recalled that he had been himself some years ago a member of the Opposition. From irresponsible opposition he had migrated to the 'irremovable executive.' Indian members of the Executive Council joined it knowing full well the limitations under which they

---

\* See Major-General Molesworth's paper—'Asiatic Review,' Jan. 1944.

function. Criticisms levelled against them were due to a sense of frustration. The sense of frustration from which the Opposition members suffer is the result of their own actions. It has engendered in them the present policy of cynicism. 'They want to bite at everything.' The Congress party bosses declared in the beginning of the war that from the international point of view they must support the war. Intellectual honesty demanded that this pronouncement should have been followed up to the letter ; but actually the Congress minorities were made to resign, and the whole thing led to the disturbances of 1942. Referring to the charge that Indian members of the Viceroy's Council were traitors, he remarked : 'If Congress members come here and sit in this House in utter disregard of the commands given them to boycott the legislatures and yet call themselves patriots of the first water, can we be called traitors if in the difficult circumstances prevailing and with most important things happening here, we come and try to do our duty to the best of our lights ? . . . We are Indians—you are our elder brothers and we are your younger brothers—and we are administering the country in your absence.'

On May 6 it was announced at Delhi that Mr Gandhi was being released on medical advice unconditionally. As his health improved he talked freely and in a manner that showed that his political views were practically unchanged. Articles reported to be his appeared in British and American newspapers. On July 25 Lords Strabolgi and Faringdon referred in Parliament to a conversation between the former and Mr Golder, correspondent of the 'Daily Chronicle,' and while he moved to discuss the present Indian political situation, Lord Strabolgi argued that Gandhi appeared from this communication to have changed his mind in regard both toward civil disobedience and agreement with Mr Jinnah, the President of the Muslim League. Lord Faringdon wished to discuss the food position, present and prospective. Lord Strabolgi told his story and was answered by the Under-Secretary of State. Lord Munster spoke at considerable length, revealing the rather complicated events that had arisen from Mr Gandhi's release and recovered vigour. The Mahatma had apparently persuaded Mr Stuart Golder that he regretted that he had

made a mistake in regard to civil disobedience. He would not allow his creed of non-violence to distract Congress from helping in the prosecution of the war. Altogether he had changed his front in that respect, and had through his friend Mr Rajagopalachari endeavoured to arrive at an understanding with Mr Jinnah regarding the future promotion of unity between Hindus and Muslims. On June 22 the Viceroy had declined to allow him to meet the Congress Committee, as it was clear from language he had lately used that such a meeting would do no good and only raise fallacious hopes. Lord Strabolgi and his friends wished to know whether now in present altered circumstances the Congress leaders could not be allowed to consult with the Mahatma and with each other. Viscount Elibank said that the question should be left to the Secretary of State and Lord Wavell. The greatest obstacle to an Indian settlement was 'the biggest bamboozler in Indian and Far-Eastern history.' The Viceroy had all the strings in his hands and knew what was going on, 'all the turns of the game as it existed in India.'

Lord Munster showed effectively that there was no change of heart in Mr Gandhi. At no time, so far as the Government was aware, had he appended his signature to any document delivered to Mr Jinnah by Mr Rajagopalachari, the mediator.\* Mr Jinnah had reserved opinion on such overtures until he had consulted the Muslim League Working Committee. But the Government had not been consulted with regard to this intercommunal matter. Lord Munster read to the Lords the terms of a document published that month by Rajagopalachari which contained proposed terms of settlement. Three were: (1) The Muslim League would endorse the demand for Indian independence and cooperate with the Congress in the formation of a provisional government for the transitional period. (2) After the termination of the war a commission would be appointed for demarcating contiguous districts in North-West and East India in which the Muslim population is in an absolute majority. In areas thus demarcated a plebiscite of all the inhabitants would be taken and would ultimately decide the issue of separation. (3) It would be open to all parties to declare their points of view

---

\* See 'Quarterly Review,' Jan. 1944, p. 43.

before the plebiscite took place. The sixth and last term was that all the terms would be binding only in the event of transfer by His Majesty's Government of both power and responsibility for the government of the land. Mr Jinnah was prepared to submit this document to his Working Committee if he received it from *Mr Gandhi* direct. He personally would not be prepared to agree to or reject it before doing so. Negotiations then apparently halted. The scheme had a very mixed reception in the Indian Press. Apparently, said Lord Munster, Gandhi's association with it marked a very significant change in his attitude towards the Muslim League position. Still it had not yet been put to the League. When it was, the issue would be more clarified. The Viceroy had received no communication from either of the participants. Then there appeared a series of statements in the Press which were attributed to Mr Gandhi. The more important contained seven points and was issued after the publication of Mr Golder's interview with Mr Gandhi. Lord Munster quoted certain passages, (1) Gandhi would never use the weapon of civil disobedience during the war unless for a very grave reason such as the thwarting of India's right to freedom; (2) he would be satisfied with a national government during the war with full control of the civil administration composed of persons chosen by the elected members of the Legislative Assembly. The Viceroy would be, like the King of England, guided by responsible ministers; (3) the Allied forces would be allowed to carry on operations on Indian soil, but the expenses would not be borne by India.

As the scheme did not result in any agreement between Messrs Gandhi and Jinnah I need not give further particulars. The whole showed that, as Mr Amery said on July 28, it was 'in no sense a response to the Viceroy's invitation to Mr Gandhi to produce constructive proposals. We must continue to hope that the time will come when we shall have before us proposals which have not been imposed upon us arbitrarily but are indispensable both because India is at war and because no future constitution is yet in sight.'

On July 27 Mr Gandhi had written to the Viceroy in course of a correspondence which dated from June 17, and pleaded that though with little cause the whole country

and even many from outside expected him to make some decisive contribution to the general good. He pleaded as a free man to be allowed to see members of the Congress under detention. But even if he were quite well he could say nothing until he knew the mind of the Working Committee of the Congress. He had circulated for private use copies of the correspondence which passed between himself and the authorities during his detention. The Viceroy gave the old answer that if Mr Gandhi would submit a definite and constructive policy he would consider it.

Interviewed by the Associated Press of India, Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, Diwan of Travancore, said on August 11, that Mr Jinnah had called a truce which Hindus and Muslims should reject. As Mr Rajagopalachari had more than hinted, it was taken for granted that Mr Gandhi's service in the past and his semi-religious dictatorship over his followers prevail over all dissent. Compromise, many including the speaker thought, will practically lead to civil war. Much as India had suffered, the suffering would have been augmented a hundred-fold but for the measure of enforced control that had been exercised, often reluctantly, by Lord Linlithgow's and Lord Wavell's Governments in the matter of procurement and distribution of foodstuffs, clothing and consumer goods, and planning for the whole country. Post-war implementing of schemes for India's economic progress would initially demand more and not less of such control. It is up to all who share that opinion to take all steps and to frustrate these dangerous proposals, which are bound to produce a state of things far worse than any which ever existed or are existing in this already distracted land of ours.

On September 9 Mr. Gandhi and Mr Jinnah met for a conference at the latter's house in Bombay. They were awaited by a battery of camera men and Indian and foreign journalists. Two days later Gandhi revealed that Jinnah had said to him : ' If we part without coming to an agreement we shall proclaim a bankruptcy of wisdom on our part.' The Mahatma added, ' What is more, the hopes of millions of our countrymen will be dashed to pieces.' Yet after days of converse and correspondence, the two men separated ; the conference broke down, or, as Gandhi phrased it '*sine die*'.

On May 31 'new vistas for India' were announced by the Delhi correspondent of 'The Times.' He was alluding to the Bombay Plan of National Development which, it is hoped, will lead to a higher standard of living for all, and is the product of eight leading Indian industrialists who are all either supporters of the Congress party or strong Nationalists in their outlook. They were to visit England later in the year with other leading industrialists. 'They defined the minimum standard of living in terms of nutrition, clothing, house-room, education, health services, which they propose should be attained within a period of fifteen years. In order to provide the standard with some pocket money in addition 'for the enjoyment of life and cultural activities' they estimated that it would be necessary to double the present 'per caput' income of the population. The gross national income must be trebled during the period covered by the plan. This, they think, can be done by central planning and regimentation of Indian resources. 'The Times' correspondent said that the Muslims were against the plan, arguing that it is an indirect approach to the old goal, the capture of the citadel of political power for the Congress party. But as a statement of desirable objectives to be attained within a fixed period of years, even at the cost of great effort and inconvenience in the interval, the Bombay plan has met with such wide public approval that other political camps have had to get down to the business of economic planning. The Muslim League is still in the throes of it, and a 'peoples' plan,' the work of N. M. Roy's Indian Federation of Labour, is based on the nationalisation of the land and ownership of all new industrial development. There was then no difference between the Government and the industrialists except primarily in their estimates of what is technically, financially, and politically possible. The industrialists were thought to have over-estimated the total financial resources which will be available for the fifteen years' project. And they must assume the continuance of the present non-unitary statutory structure of India as a whole and of democratic government in British India. The government welcome the plan as suggested 'for discussion,' and some of the authors have met members of the Viceroy's Council who are concerned with post-war development. Various committees under

members of Council have been considering how to give India a better education system, and what the cost will be of surveying the field of public health, and laying down a policy which will anticipate requirements for the next fifty years for the development of power services. The Railway Board has completed a programme of post-war rehabilitation, improvement, and expansion, and the Port and Air Department has produced a plan to give India 10,000 miles of civilian air-routes.

Thus have appetites been whetted by the Industrialists' plan which was explained and commended by Mr Amery in the Commons on July 28. He made a very lucid and comprehensive speech, touching on many important points, the Bombay plan and the reception it had met, the even bolder plan of the Indian Federation of Labour. 'Nothing could be more significant,' he said of Lord Wavell's outlook in all these connections than his invitation to Sir Ardeshir Dallal, one of the authors of the Bombay plan, to join his Executive Council. Sir Ardeshir is director and partner of the Tata Iron and Steel Company whose steel works at Jamshedpur were still the greatest steel works in the British Empire. In an address to the East India Association on July 4, Professor A. V. Hill, F.R.S., M.P., spoke impressively on the subject 'Scientific Development or Disaster in India,' emphasising the great issues at stake, the urgent need in India of concentration on social and economic problems, the toll of lives and health taken by diseases, notably by those due to malnutrition, the appointment by Government of an experienced 'Health and Development Survey Committee' under a member of the Viceroy's Council, and the appointment of Dr Aykroyd, Director of the Nutritional Research Laboratories at Coonoor,\* to be a member of the Famine Commission now at work in India under Sir John Woodhead.

Professor Hill said in his lecture that a great deal had been going on behind the scenes in India lately in planning future development, *on the one hand inside the Government departments, on the other by various groups outside*. There is much ferment in thoughtful people's minds and increasing concern about the future of their country. 'What is

---

\* Founded in 1918 by Sir Robert McCarrison.

needed is a sense of national purpose—and even so there will be no easy way toward the goal.' Undoubtedly he is right.

Mr. Amery said on July 28 that in Bengal last year 'about 700,000 human beings had died in consequence of the famine either of starvation,' or, 'to a much larger extent, from ever present endemic diseases which break out on a large scale when there is malnutrition.' He praised the measures taken both in Bengal and elsewhere, the successes achieved both in Bengal and by 'the able and energetic Food member of the Central Government, Sir Jwala Srivastava.' He acknowledged the decisive intervention of Lord Wavell—'the very first act of his Viceroyalty'—and the ability and energy of Mr Casey in Bengal. Mr Casey gave a very profitable and illuminating broadcast to his people from Calcutta on July 10. One or two passages call for particular note. He said that their resources had been greatly strained to find the required number of trained administrators and experts on various lines of government activity. It was no longer possible to find the necessary numbers of middle and top grade officers with adequate experience and ability among members of the existing Services in Bengal.

Even seeking help from other provinces, they were still short. They are now drawing on the Army for Army officers for temporary administrative appointments in Bengal. In addition they had obtained a few high-level experts from England for temporary employment here—experts in food problems, agricultural, economical, general administration and organisation. Also the Government had undertaken considerable expansion and strengthening of the Publicity Department. Politics would have nothing to do with this Department. . . . During the war settled political conditions, in which administration can be carried on effectively and rigorously, are essential. 'Whilst I do not concern myself,' he said, 'with the normal conflict of political opinion that goes to make up the political life of the community, I am deeply concerned in your interests—to ensure that there is no interference with the masses of the people and the essential interests of the Province. I look to the day when the two great communities that very nearly make up the population of Bengal will be able to live and work together in greater

harmony than unfortunately exists to-day. I believe that such mutual tolerance is essential to the fruitful development of Bengal.' Mr Casey's broadcasts seem likely to do real good in Calcutta. He has apparently the gift of practical tenacity.

I have traced so far the outline of the history of the Bengal Famine and its mixed consequences, some bearing the seed of better things in future and likely to be general. I have also shown other dangers to which Bengal has been exposed and the manner in which these have been met by a comparatively small band of public servants. I will end by wishing India all good.

VERNEY LOVETT.

#### Art. 6.—THE LAW AND POOR PERSONS.

IN the summer of 1944 the Lord Chancellor appointed a Committee to inquire into present facilities 'for giving legal advice and assistance to poor persons' and to make recommendations for 'securing that poor persons in need of legal advice may have such facilities at their disposal.' Further the Committee was instructed to examine 'the existing system whereby legal aid is available to poor persons in the conduct of litigation in which they are concerned, whether in civil or criminal courts.' Inquiry into these matters was long overdue and there are indications both in the terms of reference and in the membership of the Committee that there will be willingness to propound far more drastic proposals for reform than were made by the Committee appointed in 1925 for a similar purpose. That Committee, presided over by Lord Finlay, presented in 1926 and 1928 two somewhat smug reports which produced no drastic changes.

It is well to remember that this is an old problem. An Act of Parliament of 1495 (11 Hen. VII, Ch. 12) authorised a primitive procedure for poor persons. Between that year and 1944 there lies a long history during which many mistakes, viewed from a modern standpoint, were made. To this day the financial limits of our poor persons procedure remain very low. It applies only to those with a weekly income of £2 or 'in special circumstances' £4.

There are also severe limitations on the amount of capital applicants may possess and these, if strictly enforced, would exclude all those who have responded at all well to war-time savings appeals. Having regard to the increases in wages since 1914, when these limits were laid down, the acceptance of 'special circumstances' must have become almost general; otherwise there would be little work for the Poor Persons Department. In fact this organisation, now conducted under the supervision of the Law Society, has long been fully occupied. So one obvious recommendation of the Committee will be a considerable increase in the financial scope of the scheme.

It seems a pity that the historical but patronising title 'poor persons' was accepted in the terms of reference to the Committee. Probably few of those whom the Poor Persons Department serves would accept the title poor persons. Another objection to this title is that it inevitably implies that all but poor persons have adequate access to legal assistance and to the courts. In fact the only happy litigants to-day are big industrial concerns that have to meet heavy claims for Excess Profits. It used to be said that only the very rich and the very poor could face the courts with equanimity, but there are now almost no very rich individuals. Even in the County Court, about which high hopes were raised a hundred years ago when the first County Court Act was passed, the costs are beyond reason. Although this Act of 1846 stated that cases were to be dealt with 'in a summary way,' the procedure has become so involved that two large volumes are necessary to enable lawyers to work it. An action in these courts for so small a sum as £.20 is likely to cost the loser double that amount in legal costs alone, apart from the amount of the judicial award. When my book '*In Quest of Justice*' was published (1931), few of its contents attracted more attention than a table of the costs in actual cases that a registrar of a County Court had given me. That table showed that an unopposed action for 100*l.* lent in cash cost the plaintiff £.55 in legal costs; a claim for damages arising from the detention of goods valued at £.29 was lost and cost the plaintiff £.35 for the defendant's costs in addition to his own. These costs are likely to be even higher in the future if no reform scheme is introduced. But even as they are they involve a denial of justice. The

intentions of the promoters of the original County Courts Act have never been achieved. During my last years of practice at the Bar I frequently acted as deputy judge in these courts. When doing so I sometimes was conscious of a depressing feeling that whatever I decided, there must be injustice owing to the high costs.

One consequence of the excessive cost of proceedings in the County Court can be seen by magistrates. Many who are in trouble of varying kinds go to police stations with the intention of charging the person who, they claim, has wronged them. Over and over again I have had to refuse to issue summonses or warrants for such charges as stealing, embezzlement, and fraud on the ground that the grievance, if any, constitutes a civil dispute. Thus a small tradesman finds that his roundsman has not credited in his accounts money received from this or that customer. The facts usually are as stated, but there is often a complete absence of criminal intention. The roundsman has probably found himself in a muddle. When he called on Mrs A. he found that she had no change and promises to pay next time. Mrs B. returned part of the goods she accepted last time and thus pays only part of what she owes. Mrs C. pays more than her debt because an earlier account was not paid in full. If when the employer checks the accounts money is missing, he may at once convince himself that he has been defrauded. Thus a charge of embezzlement is laid before the magistrate. But muddle may not be criminal. To take another illustration, charges of false pretences are often laid before magistrates because things that have been bought turn out to be different from what was expected. But there is a useful maxim of law 'caveat emptor'; we are all supposed to examine our purchases before we buy them. The law also says that commercial flattery of goods sold must not be interpreted too strictly. Before a case of false pretences begins there has to be a test, by either police or magistrate, to see whether the legal requirements about intention to defraud are present. These requirements are not fulfilled in many cases where purchasers are dissatisfied. Other illustrations could be given. The important question is why police and magistrates are troubled in this kind of case. A Police Station is not more inviting for the stranger than a County Court. The reason

why application is made to the police is that no fees are charged at Police Stations. If the police take up cases of this sort as far as laying the written evidence before a magistrate, and this often happens, the injured party has nothing to pay. I find that it is an unpleasant duty to have to inform aggrieved parties in such cases that I have no power to help them and that if they want to take action it must be in the County Court. I have to warn them that in those courts they will have to put money down before anything is done and that before the end the case may cost a lot of money. Such applicants leave the court with a sense of grievance.

In High Court litigation the costs can seldom amount to less than £150 on each side. This means that in addition to the amount of any judicial award the loser must pay at least £300 in legal expenses ; often the loser has to pay £500 or more. If there are appeals these costs increase greatly. Responsibility for this state of affairs rests on the Judicature Acts of 1873-75. When the Bill which became the first of these Acts was before the House of Lords the Lord Chancellor of the day explained that 'it is desirable to provide as far as possible for cheapness, simplicity, and uniformity of procedure,' but in fact the Act accomplished the very reverse, so much so that protests came even from high judicial circles. 'The Times' of August 9, 1892, contained a strong letter of protest from a judge against the complicated nature of the new procedure. Three years previously the first Lord Coleridge, Lord Chief Justice, wrote that 'if I could have foreseen, as perhaps I ought, how the Judicature Act would have worked, I would have resigned sooner than be a party to it.' None the less the procedure set up by these Acts has remained fundamentally unaltered to this day. This procedure was well described in our own day by the London Chamber of Commerce in a memorandum sent to the Lord Chancellor (April 1930).

'It is as if a person who wished to buy a cheap car were told that he could only have a Rolls or a Daimler. He would at once admit that the Rolls or the Daimler was the best of cars, but he would say that he could not afford it. So with our present system of litigation.'

The gloomy history of the Workmen's Compensation Acts, now on their deathbed, shows how present procedure

works in practice. The original Act of 1897 was a model of simplicity ; it showed an intention that cases under it should be decided cheaply and simply. But masses of decided cases on innumerable points under this and succeeding Acts have resulted in the law on the subject being highly technical and expensive in its operation. It is not surprising that proposals are now made to sweep the whole legal jungle away and to substitute therefor an official scheme. Many other instances could be cited. The procedure in the High Court is so complicated that the two volumes that describe it contain over 3,000 pages. The rules of procedure are so involved that appeals on points of practice are frequent. The case of *Lyell v. Kennedy* (1882) concerning a point of practice went finally to the House of Lords. Yet the parties to actions who have to pay for such appeals can have no interest in the points under discussion.

This is the background of the Committee about poor persons. Whatever recommendations are made by this Committee, the legal situation must, having regard to the terms of reference, remain profoundly unsatisfactory. During August and September last there was a lengthy correspondence about legal reform in the columns of '*The Times*' . These letters showed a widespread dissatisfaction with present conditions. Even barristers and solicitors wrote letters showing that they realised that our present system could not suit the post-war world. As one who for many years has taken a great interest in these matters I should have liked to see a Committee appointed to consider the general legal situation before one to deal with the position of poor persons, for in my opinion the legal destiny of poor persons cannot adequately be settled until there is action which will provide much lower scales of costs in litigation generally.

There is one fatally easy solution to the problem of providing facilities for litigation for those in the lowest economic levels, a solution that several of those who took part in '*The Times*' recent correspondence definitely advocated. This is to leave the legal machine as it is and to arrange that the State shall pay all expenses incurred in the litigation of poor persons. Thus in High Court cases in which a poor person was concerned the present involved procedure would be accepted. His counsel

would draft pleadings which only lawyers can possibly understand and which do not set out the realities of the case. Interlocutory applications in the 'Bear Garden' could take place at much cost; against the decisions on procedure so obtained there could be appeals. The solicitors in the case would still be paid largely for the work that need not have been done and counsel's fees would still include payments for his clerk. If a leading counsel were engaged, the two-thirds rule would apply in fixing the junior's fee. That this is no phantasy is shown by the pamphlet issued by the Haldane Society, 'the organisation of socialist lawyers affiliated to the Labour Party.' In this pamphlet, 'The Law and Reconstruction,' it is suggested that a 'Public Legal Service Department' be set up which shall maintain 'Legal Advice Bureaux' in 'the offices of every local authority.' Small fees are to be charged where possible, but the balance of costs, which must be considerable, shall 'in so far as necessary' be recovered from the Treasury. There are no proposals for making the cost of judicial process more in accord with modern needs. The pamphlet also suggests that the cost of all successful appeals shall be paid out of public funds. Such a plan might be convenient for barristers and solicitors; it would after the war probably make poor persons cases popular with the profession. But I cannot imagine a worse line of action. It is far too easy to leave the present legal world untouched and to pay out of the exchequer the cost of the litigation of poor persons. Before any such scheme could become practicable there would need to be a thorough overhaul and simplification of procedure, both in the High Court and the County Court.

There are many substantial objections to any scheme for making a public charge of poor persons litigation. Whatever financial limit be fixed to define poor persons, injustice would of necessity be caused to those above the limit. Logic would demand a procedure whereby those near the limit would receive varying degrees of assistance. Presumably there would have to be a means test for litigants and various scales of relief. If those with  $X$  pounds per week are to have free litigation at the country's expense, those with  $X$  plus must be considered and cannot be left at the mercy of the present ruinous system. Thus it would seem better to begin with a heavy reduction of

the cost of all litigation and then to consider what further steps are necessary for those on the lower economic levels.

Another objection to any scheme to place the cost of litigation by poor persons on the national exchequer is the obvious injustice to the opponents of poor persons, who may win their case. Injustice to the opponents of poor persons exists under the present system and I drew attention to it in '*In Quest of Justice*' . It is inherently wrong that any litigant, be he an individual or a body corporate, should be placed in the position of having of necessity to pay all his own legal costs even if he wins his action. Cases are on record where a poor person fought his case up to the House of Lords, losing in each court ; thus the unfortunate defendant had to pay his costs in the three courts. It is much to be hoped that the Committee will take this aspect of their problem into sympathetic consideration. Any scheme for widening the financial limits for poor persons that ignores the fate of the opponents of poor persons must increase the volume of injustice to the latter. I gave much thought to this matter when writing '*In Quest of Justice*' . I came to the conclusion that the best way of avoiding injustice to opponents is to offer them trial by conciliation. This would mean that at the outset the opponent would have a free choice. If he did not mind the certainty of heavy legal costs, win or lose, he could elect to fight his case on existing methods. But if, which is more likely, he objected to such a course, he could elect to lay his case before an arbitrator to be decided not according to court procedure and strict laws of evidence, but by principles of conciliation. There is plenty of experience in many countries of procedure by conciliation. There should be an inquiry into the experience of Sweden, Denmark, France, and other countries, and certain states of the United States of America. The original Bill to establish County Courts in this country, prepared under the inspiration of Lord Brougham, contained proposals for conciliation, but legal opposition was too strong. The idea should be revived and reconsidered. Its application in all civil courts is, in my opinion, fully practicable. Only in this way can a poor persons procedure avoid injustice to those who are not poor persons.

In devising any new scheme for poor persons much care will be necessary lest fruitless litigation be encour-

aged. In the final report of Lord Finlay's committee of 1928 it was well said that it is not 'in the interests of a State that its citizens . . . should be litigious' (para. 17). During the years 1921-31 my professional work brought me many contacts with continental lawyers. All of them who made any study of our English legal methods expressed surprise at the small number of our judges. They could not understand how we could manage with our number of High Court and County Court judges. Of course one explanation is that our magistrates' courts do much of the civil work that would fall to judges in continental countries. But even so, it is true that we have comparatively few judges because we are not a litigious nation. It would not be good if we became one. The main need of poor persons, as of other people, is legal advice, not litigation. The witnesses before the committee of 1928 'were unanimous in saying that in an overwhelming majority of the cases advice only is required.' Metropolitan magistrates have much experience of the legal needs of poor persons and of many of those who would be offended by any such name. Before we begin our day's work, all and sundry come to us with their problems. These applications give us opportunities for knowing where the legal shoe pinches. This experience has taught me that the law never can provide a remedy for many of the problems of our applicants. Where there is a legal remedy, as in cases of assault and threats of violence, in fact legal decisions are often impossible. The reason is that those concerned in such cases become hopeless witnesses by reason of the fact that at the time of the events complained of tempers were up to such a degree that objective evidence is impossible. It is amazing to hear two utterly inconsistent accounts from two people who were concerned in the incidents under investigation. If there are corroborating witnesses they are usually related to the parties and tell on oath the same story that has already been heard. In such cases there is almost never any really independent evidence. No legal trial is possible in such circumstances. Nine out of ten of such cases before me end in my decision that I have no means for deciding between the differing statements. So I make use of that very English and most useful procedure of binding both parties over to keep the peace towards them-

selves and everybody else. Similar situations arise in cases of abuse in a public place, which in some measure take the place of slander actions in the High Court. Much unhappiness arises from unfair criticism or abuse between neighbours, particularly when aspersions are alleged about morality in marriage, or the validity or non-existence of 'marriage lines.' In overcrowded areas this kind of abuse is sadly frequent, but again there is no possibility of legal decision in most of such cases for reasons just given. All that magistrates can usually do is to talk firmly to both parties and to urge upon both that they should confine their conversation with their neighbours to neutral subjects. Another reason why judicial decision is often impracticable is that many of the lower-paid wage-earners are not prepared to accept it. On countless occasions people have come to me at application time with what is to them a substantial grievance. When I offer them facilities to issue a summons against the party alleged to have done them wrong, they will often say: 'I don't want a summons.' What such people want is that I shall at once despatch a posse of police to right their wrong. When I explain that I cannot act till I have heard both sides, these worthy but simple people will leave the court, displaying all the signs of grievance. No legal procedure could satisfy them. When facilities are improved for poor persons to take their troubles to the civil courts, much care will be necessary lest fruitless litigation be encouraged. People need to be taught that they should themselves solve many of their difficulties, that abusive and often anonymous letters should be put in the waste paper basket, that silent contempt is usually better than public argument, and that courts, whether civil or criminal, are not universal providers. It needs to be remembered that even legal advice, to say nothing of legal proceedings, is not a universal need. Most people, whether poor persons or not, go through life without any need to consult lawyers.

None the less the increasing complexity of life to-day creates a need that legal advice shall be made more easy for those who cannot pay fees to professional men; there will have to be also some extension of the present facilities for poor persons' litigation, especially in the County Court. The Finlay Committee strongly condemned plans for the organisation 'either by municipalities or by the state' of

facilities for legal advice, or litigation to be conducted, by 'solicitors specially retained by the municipality or the state' (para. 18 of the Final Report). Such plans are similar to those of the Haldane Society. The idea behind such plans was well explained by Dr E. J. Cohn in the 'Law Quarterly Review' (July and October 1943).

'Legal aid is a service which the modern state owes to its citizens as a matter of principle. It is part of that protection of the citizen's individuality which, in our modern conception of the relation between the citizen and the state, can be claimed by those citizens who are too poor to protect themselves. Just as the modern state tries to protect the poorer classes against the common dangers of life, such as unemployment, disease, old age, social oppression, etc., so it should protect them when legal difficulties arise.'

It seems to me that there is a false assumption behind such opinions as this, namely that it is in the interests of the community that all its members should bring their troubles before the courts. For the reasons given above, I believe this view to be both wrong and dangerous. A better and safer course would be to strengthen, help, and extend the existing schemes for providing 'Poor Man's Lawyers.' The Finlay Committee decided that a subsidy to these institutions, whether by state or by municipality, would 'embarrass' them and that such a subsidy would necessitate 'supervision and inspection' (para. 19 of Final Report). I am not convinced by these fears. I value the principle of voluntary help by members of the legal profession, though my own experience makes me agree with the Finlay Committee that solicitors are better suited to be Poor Man's Lawyers than are barristers. I think that the 'clients' at these centres appreciate that the lawyers with whom they discuss their troubles are volunteers and not public servants. But the voluntary principle is not incompatible with such public help as the free provision of a room, furniture, and light and heat. If these were provided by municipalities, no official inspection of the work done at the centres would be necessary. Help of this kind would presumably be given only to non-political centres. Those provided by political parties could not reasonably claim facilities from public funds. Such a solution would be possible only in urban areas. Nobody can dispute the truth of this mild state-

ment by the Finlay Committee that 'in purely rural areas the situation presents difficulties.' Whether there is much need for improved legal facilities for poor persons in rural areas is a matter into which the Lord Chancellor's Committee will presumably inquire. If such need exists, the solution will be a matter of great difficulty.

So far I have dealt only with the giving of legal advice and facilities for action in court in civil matters. But the new Committee is also concerned with present facilities for legal assistance in criminal courts. Here the law itself seems to be adequate. If there are conditions needing further action, they will relate to the administration of the law. The Finlay Committee published in 1926 a 'First Report' which dealt with legal assistance in criminal courts. Certain suggestions for improving the law were made in this report and in 1930 the Poor Prisoners Defence Act extended the facilities for providing legal aid for defendants charged with crime. There is no financial limit in criminal courts. If courts are satisfied that defendants have not the means to pay for solicitors or counsel, certificates can be given authorising the employment of lawyers paid out of public funds, provided, of course, that such employment is deemed necessary. Whatever criticism of the working of the Act of 1930 is laid before the Lord Chancellor's Committee is likely to be confined to this last point. It will probably be said that not enough certificates are granted. Beginning at the bottom, magistrates' courts may grant certificates in cases tried in such courts if 'by reason of the gravity of the charge or of exceptional circumstances it is desirable in the interests of justice' that the defendant should have free legal aid. The same applies when magistrates are hearing the evidence of the prosecution in cases that may be committed for trial by jury in a higher court. Certificates for free legal aid at trials by jury may be granted either by the trial judge or by the magistrates who have committed the defendant for trial. The conditions for this in either case are whether 'having regard to all the circumstances of the case (including the nature of such defence, if any, as may have been set up) it is desirable in the interests of justice' that aid be given in the preparation and conduct of the defence. Short of making the granting of these certificates compulsory, the law could scarcely be wider. Before

discussing the use made by our courts of these powers, a few lines are desirable on the wisdom of such compulsion. This involves the time-honoured problem of a Public Defender. It has long been argued that as almost all prosecutions are brought by the representatives of the state, the state should also provide an organisation to defend those who are accused. Such an argument ignores difficulties of real substance. So long as trial by jury exists, defences will continue to be laid before them which would have little prospect of success before a professional judge sitting alone. It would be invidious to give illustrations from recent years. Let an example given by Sir Chartres Biron in his book '*Without Prejudice*' suffice.

'Geoghegan's technique was masterly [when defending in criminal cases]. If against him, you never felt easy till you had got your verdict. Without any material he would manage to create an atmosphere of suspicion round your case which, as it was entirely baseless, was very difficult to dispel, and you found to your dismay that your case was gradually slipping away. . . . He was a master of the supreme art in defence of diverting an issue' (p. 126).

Biron cited a case where Geoghegan defended one of three defendants. 'The case [against them all] was very clear. To the evidence there seemed no answer.' But the skilful Geoghegan succeeded in interesting the jury in some side issue. 'This he did with such skill that he made this fact seem an essential point in the prosecution.' The result was that 'all the prisoners were acquitted. It was an amazing verdict, a legitimate triumph of advocacy at its best.' We need not here discuss whether the acquittal of obviously guilty people is in the public interest, or whether this kind of advocacy is really 'legitimate.' The fact suffices that this kind of advocacy can be heard, often with successful results for the defendants, in plenty of trials by jury to-day. It is, therefore, necessary to face the question whether this kind of advocacy should be paid for out of public funds. It seems clear to me that any scheme for establishing a Public Defender will involve a censorship of defences. The advocate acting for a defendant on the instructions of the Public Defender will be far more conscious of the duty that he owes to society than an advocate whose client is the defendant himself. All advocates admittedly owe a duty

to the court, but within the present rules of professional etiquette there is considerable freedom in advocates acting for defenders in criminal cases to emulate the 'triumphs' of Geoghegan. Those who are charged with criminal offences, and especially those so charged who have already been found guilty several times, will not appreciate any crippling of the freedom of their advocates. I think it may be said that advocates defending those who have been given certificates under the Poor Prisoners Defence Act have had the same liberty of action as those instructed on behalf of paying clients. So the line that reform should take, if any is necessary, is likely to be an increase in the number of defence certificates granted, rather than any compulsion or the creation of a Public Defender.

The Committee will probably find that too few certificates have so far been granted, especially before magistrates' courts that do not include a legally trained magistrate. I have too little experience of such courts to express an opinion. One of the principal difficulties in all magistrates' courts is that often defendants plead guilty without appreciating the essential legal requirements in the charge. For instance, except in the case of motor vehicles, there is no legal offence in the act of taking property, and even in using it, if there was no intention to deprive the owner of his ownership. Some people take bicycles that are left unlocked in the street, use them, and dump them somewhere convenient to themselves. I once had to deal with a foolish youth who took away a milk cart and horse, drove them for some miles, and left them standing in a road. He pleaded guilty to the theft of the cart. But as the van had the owner's name painted on it in large letters and as it had been left intact, I had no choice but to acquit the adventurous young man. So it is sometimes, as I wrote some pages back, with charges of embezzlement. The loss of the money induces some roundsmen to plead guilty, but it happens sometimes that there is in fact no guilt. A professional magistrate is able to put right such matters as these, and many experienced lay magistrates can probably do so also. But the position is always dangerous. It might be a good plan if the Committee selected a number of difficult cases, among which would be embezzlement, in which free legal defence should be compulsory, if wanted and if means for a private

defence are lacking. It is on such lines that in my opinion reform should proceed. Any such selection among the almost innumerable possible criminal charges would be difficult. But any system of universal free defences would inevitably involve a great waste of public money.

Some defendants ask for legal aid, not for the purpose of putting forward a defence, but in order to press the extenuating circumstances which they feel may moderate their punishment, or result in the use by the court of the Probation Act. I take the view that this function is better done by probation officers. Neither solicitors nor barristers receive any social or psychological training. Though I have heard from both barristers and solicitors some remarkable and helpful pleas in mitigation, I usually find that lawyers have confined themselves to the facts of the case and to such superficial extenuating circumstances as are obvious. But a good probation officer delves deeply if he is encouraged by the defendant to do so. Such matters as defective upbringing, bad heredity, unsatisfactory matrimonial conditions, and so on are often brought up by probation officers, especially in connection with younger defendants who have either pleaded or been found guilty. At present probation officers are not universally in attendance in the higher courts. At present also many of the courts, both high and lowly, do not allow time after the decision on the facts for full inquiries to be made by probation officers. I have emphasised the need for reform here in my book '*Crime and Psychology*'. It would, in my opinion, be harmful if legal aid were to be encouraged in cases where guilt is clear.

In this article I have made no attempt to write my own report on the terms of reference given to the Lord Chancellor's Committee. My object has rather been to emphasise some of the less obvious issues which will face the Committee and to arouse interest in this important subject.

CLAUD MULLINS.

## Art. 7.—SOVIET COURTS AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.

IT is difficult to compile a candid account of the Russian legal machine without causing offence to Communists. Apart from Marshal Stalin and perhaps a few others the standpoint taken by Communists is somewhat Gilbertian. In their view Russian law and the Stalin Constitution are 'the embodiment of everything that's excellent,' having no fault or flaw, and the most careful attention must be paid to terminology lest the perfection of the structure be marred. Thus, vehement objection would be taken by Communists to a statement that the U.S.S.R. is a federation of communistic states. Communists insist that the term 'Communist State' involves a contradiction in terms. The theory is that there will in time be a merger of the State apparatus with the masses 'thus preparing the way' as Stalin has said 'for the transition from a society dominated by the dictatorship of the proletariat into a Stateless society, into a communist society.' It is not easy to hazard a guess as to the conditions under which it would be practicable to abolish all State machinery; but it must be assumed that communists sincerely believe that it will be possible, in the fullness of time, to do away with all State machinery. I will return to this point later. The U.S.S.R. is described in the Stalin Constitution of 1936 as a Socialist state of workers and peasants, based economically upon the socialist system, and what is termed the socialist ownership of the implements of production as a result of the liquidation of the capitalist system of economy, the abolition of private property in the implements and means of production, and the abolition of the exploitation of man by man (Art. 4 of the 1936 Constitution). Lands, forests, factories, mills, mines, railways, and waterways are said to be the possession of the whole people. With regard to the collective farms the position is expressed rather differently. The produce, livestock, farm buildings, and implements are said to be secured to the collective farmers for ever, though it is clear that the ownership is in the State.\* Even in

---

\* The model constitution for collective farms lays it down that the land occupied by the collective farm is, 'like all other land in the U.S.S.R., the general property of the *State and the nation*.' It cannot be sold or let by the

respect of personal property no unearned income is permitted, except by investment in State concerns or State banks. As to the lands, factories, and the like which are said to be 'the possession of the whole people,' it does not follow that property which belongs to no one in particular belongs to everyone in general. Obviously such conditions could only exist during a state of revolution or anarchy. In a Soviet State land and property rights are subject to the closest control by the State.

#### THE COMMUNIST PARTY

I had almost said that the control was exercised by the Communist Party, but whatever may be the position from the practical angle, we must attribute the control of production, land, and property rights to the Republics, and ultimately to the All-Union Parliament; but in practice the Central Committee of the Communist Party controls matters of State. The position is, in some respects, as it would be in England if there were but one lawful party—say the Conservative Party—permanently in power. We should then presumably have a permanent Conservative Cabinet or successive Conservative Cabinets—a Conservative Prime Minister, Home Secretary, Foreign Secretary, Minister of Health, and so forth; and it would rightly be said that we had a Conservative Government. But, as I have indicated already, the Communist Party does not claim to have established a Communist State or

---

collective farmers, who are very much like managers employed by a company and operating in accordance with set rules laid down by the directors—except that the Company is the State, and the controlling directors the Communist Party or the official body representing that Party. The rights which are protected in connection with these farms are not the rights of individuals as such, but the rights of the collective farmers as members of the collective farms so long only as they remain such members. Each member is, however, considered to be the owner of his own dwelling house, but only, I believe, so long as he or his successor remains a member of the collective farm. Such members are also permitted to have for personal use 'a plot of land attached to the house and, as personal property, the subsidiary husbandry of the plot, productive livestock, poultry, and small farm tools—according to the statutes of the *artel*.' But, as I read the position, these rights, which are conferred upon 'every collective farm household' in respect of the house and land, are held only so long as the individuals concerned continue to constitute a 'collective farm household,' and not as property alienable and transmissible. The members can, perhaps, call their homes their own—so long as they *remain* members.

even a Communist Government. It is insisted that the federated Republics are *Socialist* Soviet Republics striving towards Communism.

However, the continued existence of the State is contemplated by Stalin so long as Russia is surrounded by Capitalist States. Throughout Lenin's and Stalin's pronouncements fear is perceptible—fear of the enemy without and of possible enemies within.

#### SELF-PRESERVATION

Self preservation is the dominant instinct of the animal kingdom and of man. A State in the making is the creation of those who have laboured much, who have ventured all, and who have overcome opposition. It is no matter for surprise that elaborate precautions should be taken by those who have launched the ship of State to ensure that it shall be kept afloat. Hence it is natural enough to find only one political party in such a State. Where there is but one permitted ideology and no monarch, and where the sources and control of production and supply are in the hands of the State, one may reasonably expect to find that there is some machinery for protecting the interests of the State. If there is no monarch against whom treasonable offences can be committed a place must be found for treason against the State. If it be true that 'severity breedeth fear' it is equally true that fear is the father of secrecy and sometimes of cruelty. A shrewd writer has said that 'Soviet Russia, in the twenty-four years of its existence, has not felt safe for a single day. . . . Russian life, thought, institutions, its factories, its farms, its schools, bear the mark of a country that has faced the world in a mood of utter certainty that one day it would have to fight for its life.'

The machinery by which the State chose to protect itself was the O.G.P.U. (Union State Political Administration), which is now part of the Commissariat for Internal Affairs, the term O.G.P.U. having been abandoned. Of that body the Webbs have written as follows : 'From the dread of the O.G.P.U. Party members (i.e. Communist Party Members) are by no means free. The O.G.P.U. agents are often unknown, even to one another, and, as often happens in any country subject to a secret police,

few leaders or officials can feel free from its surveillance.' \* Again, 'There is something ghastly in its inveterate secretiveness, even down to the detail of making nearly all its arrests in the dead of night. The public hears nothing until a brief notice in the newspapers informs it that a sentence has been carried out.' \*

It is true that public trials of persons accused of political offences have taken place : indeed, some of them have been too public and spectacular. The open avowal by the accused man of their offences has even led critics to wonder what incentive there could have been for such magnanimous conduct having regard to the obvious fate which awaited them if their guilt were established. It will also be recalled that quite recently prisoners of war on trial in Russia for war crimes were found to be ready to admit their guilt. With every desire to exclude from one's mind all thoughts of compulsion, and to assume that such trials are conducted with fairness, it is exceedingly difficult to find any reason why a man accused of a capital offence should volunteer to tie the noose around his own neck.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

The rights which the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. guarantees to its subjects are undoubtedly imposing. They have the right to work and be paid for that work, to be educated, to be maintained in sickness and old age, to follow such religion as they think fit (or none), the right to rest, the right of free speech, and freedom of the press and of holding mass meetings and street processions. The façade is imposing enough, and the window display is good. Unfortunately all that glitters is not gold. Article 1 of the Civil Code of 1922 lays it down that civic rights no longer hold when used contrary to their social and economic *raison d'être*. When that ruling is applied to the so-called freedom of the press one finds that the guarantee of freedom of speaking and writing means that one may say exactly what one pleases so long, but so long only, as one says or writes things which do not attack the Socialist régime, or, in practice, Communist Party propaganda. Thus, if we turn to '*Pravda*' (June 22, 1936) the following passage will be found :

---

\* 'Soviet Communism,' by S. and B. Webb.

'Whoever postulates the overthrow of the Socialist régime is an enemy of the people. He will not obtain a sheet of paper. . . . He will not find a hall, or a room, or a corner in which to spread his poison by speech'; and see to the like effect, 'Izvestia,' August 6, 1936. I gather that the appropriate propagandist reply to the inquiry whether private individuals may publish newspapers is somewhat as follows: 'It is quite permissible in the case of papers dealing with photography, poultry keeping, philately, or other technical subjects.' Thus it would seem that the guaranteed rights are not by any means so wide as they would appear from the wording of the Constitution. The maxim *Cessante ratione legis, cessat ipsa lex* is, in effect, paraphrased thus: 'Laws no longer hold if their strict application would be harmful to the Socialist régime.'

I have already mentioned the background of fear. The founders of the Constitution have thought it necessary to reckon not only with the enemy without, but also with enemies or potential enemies within. Rights and freedoms are conferred upon subjects of the State; but they are not to be permitted to develop into liberties and licences unchecked by safeguards which the founders of the State consider to be necessary for its preservation. Not only must the State have rights, but in the event of conflict the State must be the victor. A State which lives in fear will not make laws which free its citizens only to forge bonds for the State. An examination of the Judicial System obtaining in the U.S.S.R. leads to the conclusion that where State interests arise the dice are heavily loaded against the individual, as will be seen from the following observations.

#### THE SOVIET LEGAL MACHINE

In England the independence of our judges is secured by the fact that they hold office for life ('during good behaviour'), and are only removable on an address to the Crown by both Houses of Parliament. The position in Russia is entirely different. Whilst it is true that they are elected by vote, the conditions are such that no one except an ardent Communist is likely to hold his post for a very long period.\* A judge's tenure of office is,

\* On this point see also the observations in a later part of this article.

moreover, but a few years, and he is liable to be dismissed at any time during that term.

The following are the Courts operating in the U.S.S.R. :

1. *Comrades Courts*.—These Courts deal only with private matters such as disputes between neighbours. Small fines can be inflicted. Whilst these Courts are legally recognised they are apparently very informal and could hardly be compared with our Police Courts.

2. *Peoples Courts*.—When we turn to the Peoples Courts we find that although their name indicates their constitution it gives no clue to the very wide jurisdiction which they exercise.

These Courts are certainly aptly named, for two lay persons and one trained judge sit together. These lay persons are called 'peoples' assessors.' However, they are not merely assessors in the technical sense. If there is a difference of opinion the majority ruling prevails, so that if the two lay assessors differ from the trained legal judge their view will prevail. What is surprising to any one familiar with English courts is that courts so constituted should deal with matters of substantial importance, and even murder. They are Police Court, County Court, Quarter Sessions and Assizes all rolled into one, and exercise a sweeping jurisdiction both in civil and criminal matters. It is, however, significant that there is no trial by jury. I hardly think that the existence of lay assessors, who will normally be zealous Communists, even though not members of the Communist Party, counterbalances the absence of the right to be tried by a jury. In the case of a trial for a political offence it is a fair surmise that the accused would gladly exchange the two lay assessors for a jury.

3. *The Supreme Courts of the Union Republics* (i.e. of each Republic), and the Supreme Courts of Autonomous Republics, and Courts of Autonomous Regions, Territories, and Areas.—In these Courts there is a President, a Vice-President, and other members. They are the highest Courts of the individual Republics, Regions, etc.

4. *Military Tribunals, Railway and Water Transport Courts*.—The names of these Courts sufficiently indicate the nature of the offences with which they deal.

5. *Supreme Court of the U.S.S.R.*—This Court has a jurisdiction superior to that of the individual Union

Republic Courts and is the Supreme Court of the whole Union, and its jurisdiction is superior to that of the Union Courts. It is difficult to establish a comparison between the House of Lords and this All-Union Court. It consists of a President, Vice-President, and other members. We have, of course, a Chancellor who sits on the Woolsack, and is President of the House of Lords when it sits as a final Court of Appeal. On the other hand we have no subdivision as in Russia, where the All-Union Supreme Court consists of five 'Collegia' dealing with criminal, civil, railway, water transport, and military cases respectively.

#### PROTESTS

The Supreme Courts of the Republic and the All-Union Supreme Court have jurisdiction to deal with 'Protests,' a term unknown to English law. Protests in criminal cases—though I gather that the term has a rather wider meaning—are appeals by the prosecution. In England there are, of course, no appeals by the Crown in criminal cases. The idea that a man, acquitted by a jury, should then be tried again is foreign to our conception of justice. The legal maxim '*Nemo debet bis vexari*' and the plea of '*autrefois acquit*' are regarded as bastions protecting citizens from persecution by the State. In Russia the Appeal Courts may even order that the case be brought before them for review after the accused has been acquitted. An English lawyer may perhaps be forgiven if he expresses grave doubt concerning the desirability of such a potential means of persecution.

#### APPEALS

Though the citizen may be brought by protest from one Court to another until he is brought before the highest Court of the U.S.S.R., it does not seem that the individual can ever appeal to that Court, though he may be brought before it by that Court or by the instrumentality of State officials. He can normally appeal from the Peoples Court to the next higher Court of his Republic,\* but he can go no farther. The State by its

\* 'Republic' here means Autonomous Republic, Province, Territory, Area, or Region (which are sub-divisions of the Union Republics) and not the Union Republic of which it forms part.

appropriate instruments may, however, appeal to the highest Court—the All-Union Supreme Court above mentioned. If not successful there the State may go one step farther, and appeal to a full sitting of the All-Union Supreme Court, assuming that the President of that Court or the All-Union Procurator is prepared to file the necessary 'protest.' What would be the position of a person whose conviction of a crime the Communist Party regarded as desirable or even important? Even if lay assessors were not normally loyal to the Communist Party and its aims, they could not save the accused, for no lay assessors sit in Appeal Courts. One might almost say that the participation of the public in the administration of justice and their protection from persecution from the State are in inverse ratio to the importance of the issues, for if lay assessors give a majority verdict, that verdict may be reversed by a superior court where only professional judges may sit. But is there any reason for supposing that the judges will not discharge their duties in a strictly impartial manner? It is difficult to give the answer. Let a Peoples Commissar of Justice speak for himself, 'The peoples judges . . . must be people of high culture, honestly and boundlessly devoted to the cause of the party of Lenin and Stalin.' These words were spoken in 1938. The 'party' referred to is, of course, the Communist Party. It is right to point out that there is an Article in the 'Stalin' Constitution of 1936 which declares that the judges are independent and shall be subordinate only to the law. But as the 'window-dressing' in that Constitution is so much at variance with the actual state of affairs, and as the judges are themselves dismissible at short notice, and must be 'boundlessly devoted' to the Communist Party, it is difficult to attach much importance to the word 'independent,' particularly as it is followed by the warning that they are subordinate to the law.

Stalin has explained that one of the difficulties confronting the Communist Party is 'the possibility of the State apparatus breaking loose from Party control, the possibility of the Party losing its position of leadership in respect of the State apparatus.' . . . 'Our task,' in his words, 'is to reduce the State apparatus as far as possible, . . . to assign Party members to the nodal points in the

*State apparatus* and to see to it that the apparatus of State is thus *subjected* to the Party leadership.' \* I think that the Courts of the U.S.S.R. may fairly be termed part of the State apparatus, and it may be concluded that the judges occupy 'nodal points.' The inference is obvious, and if it is correct the judiciary cannot be regarded as impartial, a characteristic which is of greater importance than 'independence,' whatever that may mean. In such a country one will not find, and could hardly expect to find, a Habeas Corpus Act; and is not the independence of the judges denied so long as they can readily be dismissed? That battle was fought and won in England many years ago.

#### EVIDENCE

The correct answer to the question 'What are the main rules of evidence which prevail in the U.S.S.R.?' is, 'There are no rules of evidence.' What the soldier or the sailor said is evidence. Whatever any one did or said is evidence. Though it may be conceded that some of the technical rules of English law in this respect may be too narrow, it is always to be remembered that according to settled English law doubtful evidence should be excluded upon the principle that certain kinds of evidence tend to deprive an accused person of a fair trial either because it might prejudice the Court or the jury, or because it is not the best evidence obtainable. Such are the rules which, with certain exceptions, prevent the prosecution from tendering evidence of the criminal record of the accused in order to create the impression that the accused is a criminal, and which insist that the Court should be told by A, and no other person, what A said on a given occasion.

Though the exclusion of such evidence may occasionally lead to the escape of a guilty man its admission might lead, in other cases, to the wrongful conviction of an innocent one. On balance it has been felt that the criminal law should err on the side of generosity towards the accused in the matter of evidence, and that the strictest proof of the offence should be adduced.

However, it must be admitted that some technical

\* 'Leninism,' by Joseph Stalin.

rules of evidence have been severely criticised. Thus it has been said of the rule that an accused person cannot be required to answer any question if the reply might tend to incriminate him, that this is the first rule which the criminal class would formulate if left to frame their own laws, and that it would almost seem that such notions had been drawn from the laws of honour relating to combat. Hence, although we may properly say, if we are of that opinion, that the abolition of such safeguards for accused persons would offend our sporting instincts, or our notions of justice, we cannot properly say that, even in this country, public opinion is unanimously in favour of the retention of those safeguards.

#### DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

Although by the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. the highest organ of State power of each constituent Union Republic is the Supreme Soviet of that Republic, and the highest organ of State power of the U.S.S.R. is the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., and various other bodies are endowed with executive and administrative powers of a superior or subordinate nature, the immediate control of matters of State rests, as I have indicated, with the Communist Party. As Marshal Stalin has said, 'The Political Bureau is the supreme authority of the Party, and not the supreme authority of the State.' Nevertheless, 'in all fundamental questions alike of home and of foreign policy, the Party is the guide.' But Marshal Stalin insists that the function of the Party is leadership and not 'dictatorship in the strict sense of the term ("power based directly on force").' It may be conceded that the function of the Communist Party is leadership, but as that Party is the only lawful political party, the practical result is precisely the same. It is true that Stalin has constantly reiterated that the State apparatus must be linked up with the masses, and that it does not 'stand over' the people and dare not alienate itself from them.\* But in order to achieve this object *without weakening the Party* what is to be done? His answer is that it is to be achieved by bringing the masses into the everyday work of the Government, so that a vast body of

\* See e.g. Stalin's 'Leninism,' pp. 49 and 298.

enthusiastic non-Party but pro-Party workers will be built up, thus multiplying, as Stalin has said,\* the personnel of the State apparatus tenfold. This has no doubt been achieved already, and vast numbers of enthusiastic non-Party workers supercharged with the terminology of Communist propaganda are scattered over Russia (and some few elsewhere). The result of this immense increase in the personnel of the State apparatus, according to Stalin, will be that the State apparatus will be merged with the masses 'thus preparing the way for the transition from a society dominated by the dictatorship of the proletariat into a Stateless Society, into a Communist Society.' †

#### COMPULSORY ORTHODOXY

In other words, the State will in due course perform the difficult operation of swallowing itself in its own personnel and then dissolving into thin air. Even if this presents an exaggerated picture of the process which is contemplated, it seems clear that the general plan is that there shall be established throughout the land a people with but one lawful political line of thought—all who refuse to toe the line being regarded as traitors. May we not say with Herbert Spencer, 'Unless opinions favourable to democracy and to aristocracy, to property and to equality, to cooperation and to competition, to sociability and to individuality, to liberty and to discipline, and all other standing antagonisms of practical life are expressed with equal freedom, and enforced and defended with equal talent and energy there is no chance of both elements obtaining their due. . . . We wish not automatons, but living originating men and women.'

Whilst it remains the law in Russia that criticism of the Socialist régime causes the forfeiture of legal protection, it is hardly too much to say that Russian subjects do not enjoy true freedom. Whilst the Press is termed the Peoples Press, its true function may best be gathered from the leader which appeared in the 'Soviet War News' for May 18, 1944, and from which the following is culled :

'It is their task to give full publicity to Party and Young Communist activities, to provide our agitators and propa-

\* See e.g. Stalin's 'Leninism,' pp. 49 and 298.

† *Ibid.*, p. 300.

gandists with spiritual food, ever to safeguard the purity of Marxist-Leninist theory, mercilessly to criticise ideological distortions and mistakes, to develop revolutionary vigilance, to train their readers to be men and women of principle, irreconcilable.'

I must leave it to the reader to consider whether 'irreconcilable' men and women are likely to become, as Spencer puts it, 'living originating men and women' or 'mere automatons.'

However, the Russians have faced hard facts and have performed prodigious feats both in peace and war. Nor is there any reliable evidence of a widespread struggle by the people of Russia to throw off the shackles placed upon them by the Socialist régime—which impinges at almost every point upon their activities. It is probably almost impossible for the average man who has been brought up in an atmosphere of individualism to imagine what life would be like in a Socialist State, or for a man accustomed for many years to the Party System to imagine the conditions which would obtain if there were but one political party. What if the tenets of the one lawful political party embodied the best of the tenets of the various existing political parties? Can any one say with certainty that his political views will, if followed, produce the best possible results for his nation? Clearly, if he is honest, he can only say that in his opinion those results would follow. But the point is that he should be *allowed* to say it if he is in truth a free man. In due time, when the element of fear has disappeared, the justice of this view may be recognised in Russia. Stalin has often insisted upon the necessity for elasticity, and has proved in many ways his foresight and his capacity to adapt his actions and policy to changed circumstances. His action in dissolving the Comintern may be a practical step towards the renunciation of earlier proposals to disseminate international revolution. As another writer has said, the need of the world for settled peace is very great. If the older democracies have half the answer and Russia has the other half it is perhaps not too much to hope that the two halves can be put together.\*

E. O. WALFORD.

---

\* Jennie Lee in 'Our Ally Russia.'

## Art. 8.—LORD HARDINGE OF PENSHURST.

ONE of the innumerable by-products of the war has been the curtailment of obituaries in 'The Times.' Informed, impartial, and comprehensive, they have traditionally served as nucleus to many a subsequent biographical study. The paper shortage has affected, not their quality, but their completeness ; so the notice which appeared when Lord Hardinge of Penshurst died contained less than half, probably, of what would have been said of him in peace-time. And the tribute paid in the House of Lords by its leader, Lord Cranborne, though most appreciative, was very brief, and unrecorded in the Press. The two tributes together contained no more than a couple of sentences about the memorable series of visits which King Edward VII paid to foreign Courts and Capitals between 1903 and 1910, when Hardinge, then an Under-Secretary at the Foreign Office, was his almost invariable companion.

King Edward, to a far greater extent than any British sovereign before or since, constituted himself his own ambassador. He did not make foreign policy, but he helped to carry it out ; and his ambassadorial influence was unrivalled in Europe. Hardinge, his trusted friend, went with him as the official representative of the Foreign Office, to which he regularly reported. Between them, under the responsible control first of Lord Lansdowne and then of Sir Edward Grey (as he then was), they gave a new orientation to British foreign policy and carried this country from isolation to close association, amounting virtually to alliance, with France and Russia.

These journeys formed the most individual and remarkable part of Lord Hardinge's career. One of the first places he visited with King Edward was Paris, and it was there, as Lord Hardinge related in one of his rare excursions into the Press, that he scored his most memorable success. We must bear in mind that between Britain and France for several hundreds of years there had existed hostility and rivalry, and that though the nineteenth century had seen an alliance for war in the Crimea and frequent alternations of quarrel and reconciliation, the old feud had flashed out fiercely over the Fashoda affair in 1898 and again during the Boer War—which had only just been concluded a year before the King's visit. King

Edward's wish to go there in 1903, therefore, seemed overbold to most of his advisers ; they had serious doubts about its wisdom. The French Government, too, though favourably inclined, felt misgivings about the way the population of Paris might react to it. Parisians have their own way of making their feelings known to eminent visitors ; and the French Government solicitously inquired at the British Embassy whether the King would wish to be received with all the customary public formalities ? The inquiry was referred to King Edward, who replied : ' I want to be received as officially as possible, and the more honours that are paid to me the better it will be.'

Hardinge was at the time on tour with the King on his Mediterranean visits to the King of Portugal, the King of Italy, and the Pope, and steadfastly approved His Majesty's courageous design to include Paris on the homeward itinerary. In the event their faith was justified ; but on arrival, during the drive down the Champs Elysées from the Bois de Boulogne station, the judgment of the doubters appeared to be vindicated, for the crowd was sullen, with an occasional cry of ' Vivent les Boers ! ' Yet three days later King Edward's tact, geniality, and unmistakable sincerity had won the capital ; and on the drive to the station of departure the people of Paris were enthusiastic in their applause ; even King Edward's sanguine spirit was surprised to hear a cry of ' Vive notre Roi ! ' The visit was a decisive political event, which gave the cue to M. Delcassé and M. Cambon, Lord Balfour and Lord Lansdowne, to go forward with the negotiation of the Entente Cordiale ; and it was Hardinge's first important contribution to British policy.

The King's value as his own ambassador at large was instantly established ; and he now set himself, with the unfailing and ready counsel of Hardinge, to win over France's friend, Russia, to terms of friendship also with Britain. Here again he was helping his Government to reverse traditional policy, for Russia had been the bogey of nineteenth-century England—had not Victoria herself called Russia England's ' perpetual and desperate foe.' Again it was Hardinge who was to be his most immediate coadjutor ; and their diplomacy, under the direction of Sir Edward Grey, met with resounding success when the

Agreement of 1907 settled outstanding differences between the two countries in regard to Persia, Afghanistan, and the Persian Gulf. Three or four years was not a long lapse of time, in that more leisureed age, for diplomatic negotiations which had so many suspicions and deep-rooted differences to overcome ; and the unfortunate episode of the Dogger Bank, when the Russian fleet, on its way to fight Japan, sank a number of British trawlers in the North Sea, did not tend to expedite them. That it did not end them altogether was in large measure due to the firmness and sagacity of Hardinge, who had been sent as ambassador to St Petersburg in 1904. The *rapprochement* with Russia was another outstanding event, in which the late Lord Hardinge was one of the leading actors.

By 1907 he was back once more in the Foreign Office, this time as Permanent Under-Secretary of State ; and the next year he was on his travels with the King again. They went together to Cartagena, a visit which was followed by the successful conclusion of the Morocco negotiations with Spain, and then on to Gaeta, where a meeting took place with the King of Italy. Three weeks earlier Prince Bülow, the German Chancellor, had met the Italian Foreign Minister in Northern Italy ; and the King Edward cum Lord Hardinge visit was interpreted in the German Press as an attempt to loosen the fabric of the Triple Alliance, which Bülow had just re-cemented.

Other journeys made by Hardinge, as Foreign Office representative with the King-ambassador, were to Reval, Athens, Cronberg, and Ischl. It was not mere chance that these German and Austrian resorts came rather late in the round of visits. In the process of emerging from Salisburian isolation it was natural that the British Government should feel its way along the paths of least resistance ; and it had realised, when the original attempt to approach Germany had been made at the turn of the century by Joseph Chamberlain, that the road to Berlin was going to provide the hardest going. King Edward had of course had frequent meetings with his nephew, the German Kaiser, during Queen Victoria's reign ; and at the beginning of his own reign he had paid a spectacular but not very fruitful visit at Kiel. But the King and Hardinge both seem to have regarded a full, official, and most formal visit to Berlin itself as the necessary climax of their jour-

neyings abroad. Unfortunately each preliminary journey had the effect of increasing the misgivings and fidgetiness of Germany, which was then as always morbidly nervous about being encircled, and saw in every successful visit of King Edward another segment built into its own *Einkreisung*. And so it came about that the visit to Berlin, when it happened in 1909, instead of being the climax and culmination of King Edward's labours for peace, was an anti-climax. Not only was naval rivalry by that time causing increased tension on either side, while the British proposals for its regulation conveyed to Germany the impression that we desired above everything to avoid a fight ; but also King Edward's health was beginning to fail. Once, at the opera, he fell asleep, and an artificial conflagration on the stage awoke and alarmed him. After a luncheon at the British Embassy he was seized with a terrible fit of coughing which produced a state of temporary collapse. His tact and his *bonhomie* had their effect upon the Berlin public ; but the Germans are more apt than most races to measure rivals by their physical prowess ; and politically and personally the last visit of the King was a melancholy contrast to that early one in Paris, of which it was intended to be the ultimate fulfilment in the pilgrimage of peace-making.

It is impossible at present to determine exactly the part in the itinerant diplomacy of King Edward which was played by Lord Hardinge. His share will be more clearly shown when the Memoirs, which Lord Hardinge wrote and confided to the keeping of his son, in due course come to be published. They will certainly have profound interest and importance for the diplomatic history of the Edwardian period. On the occasions when Hardinge remained in the Foreign Office while the King was abroad, or when Hardinge was abroad and the King in London, letters passed regularly between them ; these too have their place in the Memoirs.

In the meantime Lord Grey has left it on record that 'Hardinge's reports to the Foreign Office were real, full, authentic, and confidential.' When King Edward was conversing with monarch or ruler, Hardinge usually saw his responsible Minister in attendance ; and the partners, for they were friends as well as master and servant, compared notes before Hardinge reported back to Grey, who

had complete confidence in his integrity and his judgment. Some recent writers have tended to belittle the part played by King Edward in the diplomacy of the period. They are generally critics who base their judgments on written records, as indeed is proper for historians. But in diplomacy more than any other political business the spoken word is important and is often unrecorded. Moreover the manner, the gesture, even the tone in which an admission is made or a fact presented may be pregnant with meaning ; and these are known to the negotiators alone. A saying of the historian Clarendon is very apt : ' It is not a collection of records or an admission to the view and perusal of the most secret letters and acts of State that can enable a man to write history, if there be an absence of that genius and spirit and soul of an historian which is contracted by the knowledge and course and method of business, and by conversation and familiarity in the inside of Courts, and with the most active and eminent persons in the Government.'

The British Foreign Secretary himself, in any case, never underrated the work that Lord Hardinge was doing. Sir Edward Grey cordially insisted on Sir Charles Hardinge, as he then was, accompanying the King on his 1907 visit to Marienbad, when a meeting had been arranged with the Kaiser on the outward journey. Grey wrote that the King's last two cruises in the Mediterranean had been ' distinctly profitable ' from the Foreign Office point of view, ' since the Cretan question was settled at Athens last year, and the Spanish notes at Cartagena last April.'

King Edward and Hardinge failed indeed to change the intention of Germany to challenge Britain in war ; but they helped to better our relations with the Mediterranean countries, as recorded above, which also included Italy ; and they jointly contributed to provide us with our two greatest Allies, France and Russia, in 1914. Thus they helped to bring many nations to our side in the years of anticipation—which in this imperfectly organised world is still the best way to make sure of winning the next war.

King Edward died in 1910, less than a year after his visit to Berlin. In the last days of his life he earnestly opposed the suggested appointment of Hardinge to be Viceroy of India. He exclaimed to Lord Morley, Secretary of State for India, ' Hardinge is a diplomatist, not an

administrator.' The royal opposition to the known wishes of Hardinge may have owed more to the ageing King's desire to keep his ' trusty and well-beloved ' friend near him than to a real belief in his lack of fitness for the Vice-regal post. Lord Hardinge had already showed himself to be something of an administrator at the Foreign Office, where the Permanent Under-Secretary has to double the role of adviser on policy with that of chief of the bureaucratic machine. In the years 1906-1910, in spite of his excursions abroad, Hardinge had paid a good deal more attention to the second—and usually secondary—part of his duties than any of his recent predecessors. Mr Harold Nicolson indeed, in his '*Life of Lord Carnock*' speaks of him as having introduced a revolution, and calls him 'a progressive and ruthless administrator.' Perhaps his reforms, the chief of which seems to have been the extension to junior members of the privilege of minuting State papers, may have appeared more 'ruthless' to persons inside the Foreign Office than to those outside it, including King Edward ; but in any case Hardinge did move a then junior member of that august institution to record that he had transformed 'what had been a stuffy family business into an efficient Department of State.' And in the vaster field of the Indian Empire Hardinge certainly proved himself to be a competent administrator and something more. He presided over the transfer of the capital from Calcutta to New Delhi, and successfully accomplished the delicate task of undoing the work of a predecessor, Lord Curzon, by revoking the partition of Bengal. He persevered in his resolve to favour the legitimate aspirations of Indians, without regard for an attempt on his life which seriously injured him ; and throughout his Viceroyalty he continued in India the policy which he had begun in Europe of cultivating good relations with Russia. When the war with Germany which he had clearly foreseen broke out in 1914, he insisted with the Home Government that Indian troops should be sent at once to the front in Flanders, and he had a small force ready to occupy Basra when Turkey entered the war against us. The failure of the first Mesopotamia campaign brought severe criticisms upon him, which on his return to England he answered at length in a speech in the House of Lords. His period of office was extended by six months on account of the war ;

and 'The Times' summed-up his Viceroyalty in the phrase : 'History will remember Hardinge as a devoted friend to the people of India.'

In his tribute to Lord Hardinge in the House of Lords, Lord Cranborne said that he had in a pre-eminent degree 'those attributes of courage, insight, and shrewd common sense which are the essential qualities of a statesman and which, indeed, separate a statesman from the lower categories of officials and politicians.' These qualities he certainly possessed ; and they are qualities of statesmanship ; yet a man may have them, and not be a statesman (in the full and generally accepted meaning of the word). His Viceroyalty ended, Hardinge returned to London and resumed the post at the Foreign Office he had relinquished six years before. There is no precedent for a Viceroy of India becoming an Under-Secretary of State. In Mr Lloyd George's Imperial War Cabinet were two illustrious pro-Consuls, Lord Curzon and Lord Milner ; but there seems to have been no question that Lord Hardinge should make a third. The truth is that Hardinge was no politician ; and to be a statesman you must be a politician too. You must know how to make your way through the rough-and-tumble of Party warfare ; you must combine with your sense of service a habit of hitting hard, and with proper reticence a readiness to argue keenly with opponents and talk readily with the crowd. These were attributes which Hardinge did not possess. I remember an episode in Paris, where in 1920 he took over the Embassy—his last public post. The occasion was a Press dinner ; and the British Ambassador was called upon to speak. He spoke, and spoke well. But his uneasiness was almost painful ; he told the assembled journalists that he would always be delighted to see them, but he implored them in almost supplicating tones not again to call upon him to make a speech. His nature was probably too reserved for the publicity which political life demands. His taste was for influence rather than for power. No political prophet at the Carlton Club ever tipped 'Charlie' Hardinge for Prime Minister.

As Lord Cranborne regretted in the House of Lords, Lord Hardinge did not take a prominent part in its debates, although constant in his attendance. 'I think we all often wished,' the Leader of the Upper House added,

'that he would speak more.' If he had spoken more, he would have placed at the service of the public another ingredient of statesmanship which he certainly did possess, and that was an unusually shrewd foresight. He had for instance left it on record at the Foreign Office some time before 1910 that 'the German preparations for war would reach the flash-point by the end of 1913.' But he showed his natural propensity when he so modestly returned to the Foreign Office in 1916. In spite of his experience in India, he still preferred the advisory to the executive post. He was above all a Wise Counsellor. It was in that role that he made his reputation with King Edward; and Lloyd George may well have hoped that he would serve him as well when he took him to Paris in 1919 for the peace negotiations. There, however, he disappointed both his friends and the Prime Minister, whose temperament was wholly uncongenial to him. Nor did he make the success of the Paris Embassy, when he took it over in 1920, which might have been expected. It was an unsatisfactory close to so notable a career. But his usefulness did not altogether end with his withdrawal from public life. Many eminent persons, still engaged in the service of the country, continued to consult him through the twenty years of his retirement. They came away, as Lord Cranborne well expressed it, strengthened by his serenity and courage; and others in humbler station who met him and spoke with him felt that they had derived lasting benefit from his stored wisdom and generous disposition.

A. L. KENNEDY.

#### Art. 9.—BRITAIN AT WAR.

THE British are celebrated for their disinclination to enthusiasm: Mr Granville Barker spoke in 'The Madras House' of 'that least English of all dispositions—intellectual passion,' but passion of any kind is unusual with us; the British race in general dislikes extremes. We have never been stampeded, which is our strength; we have seldom been deeply roused, which is our weakness. An intelligent foreigner observed, 'the trouble with you

is that you never really work unless you're frightened—and you are never frightened': that may or may not be true; it is certainly not the whole truth: but this basis of our national character has not been sufficiently realised in this war by any one—except, perhaps, Mr Winston Churchill. Alternately throughout this mighty struggle, we have been subjected by Government spokesmen and press publications alike to waves of depression and inflation, treated, in fact, rather as though we were an odd species of football: by now we are pretty well hardened to it, but the process still goes on, and it has never been more in evidence than during these autumn months of 1944.

There was a period when, if one went by the exuberance of the words of many a leader-writer and war-commentator, everything was over bar the victory bonfires and ceremonial parades: then we were told rather sharply that we must certainly not think any such thing, the war was far from won and Field-Marshal Sir Bernard Montgomery ceased to speak so optimistically, whilst my pessimist friend was reinforced in his unchanging belief that it would take till November 1947, to finish off Germany and a further two years after that to defeat Japan. And now, at the beginning of November 1944, as the bonfires that we light are either for the sake of clearances in the garden or, it may still be, in faithful remembrance of the ill-fated Guy Fawkes (not 'a wise guy,' if an Americanism of to-day may be interpolated) the scales of opinion, as expressed in speeches and articles, have swung once again to a more even stability.

No more than on August 8 when I last wrote is it possible to pause and draw up a balance-sheet (I write on November 3): 'there is rest for the weary on the other side of Jordan,' doubtless; but not here and now. There is no rest, yet, for any one; and for many these days have been quite as strenuous as any since September 1939, with prospects of unremitting energy for a long, long time to come. But, nevertheless, what a transformation! It is permissible to draw a breath of realisation, to remember that 'le sale Boche' has as little hold now on the soil of France as he ever had of her soul—here and there he is battling dourly on it, but cut off and with no hope of relief, to remember also that Belgium and Greece

are liberated, that the agony of Holland is ending, that the shackles are loosening on Norway, that the Allies stand on the territory of the Reich both on the east and the west, that the flag of the United States of America flies once more in the Philippines, and, not least, that the enemy has at last been forced to give battle in the Pacific with his jealously guarded fleet and has been so decisively routed that there too the only end the Allies ever envisaged is in sight.

We have had the glorious attempt at Arnhem—no one can rationally call that failure, kept back, though we were, from the full fruits of it ; we have seen, to balance that, small boys, completely Nazified, fighting on against us, one of the most dreadful things of all history, one of the direst of all Hitler's crimes, one of the most difficult of all the coming post-war problems ; we have noted the frenzied bullying by Himmler of the German people, surely as ferocious a pronouncement as has ever fallen even from that master of ferocity, and now we read in the 'City notes' of 'The Times' the opening sentence, so naïve as almost to be humorous, 'there are welcome signs that at last the Government is beginning to make its plans for the reconversion of industry from war to peace,' and we have as corollary the appointment of Sir Charles Bruce Gardner as 'Chief Executive for Reconversion,' an appointment which, we are told (and without doubt truly) 'will be greatly welcomed throughout industry.'

The date, it is necessary to remind ourselves, at which this step of appointing some one fresh, some one who is an industrialist and not a politician, to do the planning which some of the more hopeful and less experienced amongst us fondly thought had been for months and months past the preoccupation of responsible Ministers, was late in October 1944 : it put me in mind of the attitude of the War Office in October 1918 to all suggestions that peace might one day be upon us and it would be well to prepare the minds of the soldiers for some of the problems —such suggestions were not to be encouraged, they tended, it was thought, to promote war-weariness. Perhaps we have advanced a little in our reasoning as a nation since then, but only a little. Nevertheless, though the Germans with the almost unbelievable stubbornness

natural to a race that believes fighting to be the highest pursuit open to mankind, a stubbornness reinforced by the revolvers and torture-chambers of the Gestapo, have rallied from the vast defeats inflicted on them by the Battle of France and though, as the converse of that, we are all well aware—as indeed they are also—that the closing eight weeks of the year will see a crescendo of battles on German territory, though we are all of us, young and old, the tired as well as the strong, utterly resolved to press right on to the end of the road, to complete and indisputable victory, still the national mind has been turning more and more deliberately to the problems of peace. These may not prove to be as immense as were the problems of war in, say, June 1940, but they are of a size such as is comparable: we solved the first, and, doubtless, we shall solve the second—in some degree at least.

That reservation is, perhaps, an essential addition: it can hardly be said that the most auspicious of beginnings has been made. We were always bad starters and are invincibly consistent both in our virtues and our failings: we usually make up in the end. The only real trouble is that in such a matter as reconstruction there is no end, so that the beginnings have a special importance. Let us then be critical, and indeed it is not easy to be anything else. There are at least three matters attracting at present a great deal of public and private attention and comment; two are only now (November 3) coming in for real Governmental action, on the third nearly every one is markedly outspoken. These three are civil aviation, the repairing of the damage caused by the flying bomb attacks on London and the south-eastern areas of England, and the manner of the demise of the Home Guard. The three are widely different in almost all respects, but they have this one feature in common, that there is a general consensus of opinion that they have all three been handled ineptly or at any rate inadequately.

Let us, on the first, hear Lord Beaverbrook, who was for long the Minister primarily concerned, though the constitutional responsibility remained with the Secretary of State for Air. Speaking in the House of Lords on October 12, Lord Beaverbrook said—and it was, as it were, his swan-song on the subject as the new Minister

had been appointed but had not then returned from West Africa to begin his interesting but exceedingly onerous task :

' It must be confessed that in factories and on the air routes of the world at the present time our future is not very bright. It is not satisfactory. We have not been able to divert from war aviation to civil aviation as much effort as we should have liked ; in truth very little effort. There is no difference of opinion among us on that point.'

This is, surely, a triumph of under-statement, even in a land so addicted to that as ours. More bluntly, and a little previously, Lord Brabazon had declared, and in the embarrassed presence of the Secretary of State for Air, ' you are being manœuvred off the earth ' : possibly this was an exaggeration, it would certainly have been more apposite to have said ' off the air,' but at any rate it was an exaggeration based upon so much truth that it met with the heartiest round of applause of the meeting which was one attended by almost every person in this country who has been concerned for the past twenty-five years with the advancement of civil aviation. Great things have been done in this war in the development of air transport—in that respect the Air Ministry may indeed take pride, and much of the experience so gained will hereafter be invaluable ; but do not let us pretend that we have been able to maintain our vast war effort except at the expense of our future in the air in the years that immediately follow the war. We have not only built no civil planes, we have not even been able to spare designers from their intensive war work : we could do no other, we were fighting for our existence, and there is no need for apology, more especially as we were fighting also for the existence of liberty throughout the world. But there is need for realisation and admission, and, beyond that, agreement with our great Allies, the United States of America and the Soviet Republics of Russia : it is sad to note that the latter is not attending the conference at Chicago—and the way of agreement is going to be hard, but it is essential that the facts be faced.

Now, at long last the course Lord Brabazon and others have advocated for many years has been adopted : civil aviation has been removed from the control of a Ministry

which must naturally always place service aviation first and Lord Swinton is installed. It is true that he starts with the handicap of having been Secretary of State for Air, but as against that an interval has elapsed during which he has been active in matters where air transport was vital, and, moreover, he has never yet received anything like the full credit due to him for the great work he did at the Air Ministry in the crucial years when 'appeasement' was the order of the day in laying the foundations for the greatness of our present air power, and he is a man of real energy and ability who can put us on the map in civil aviation if any one can. All that can be said here and now is that it is no solution to say that as we have the bases and the Americans the planes, they can use our bases and we can use their planes : the planes on the British air routes of the future must be British. That the appointment of a Minister of Civil Aviation was long overdue no one who has been at all concerned with the development of aeronautics doubts for a moment : we are entering now upon the air age, a greater age for transport even than that of the steam engine and the turbine, an age wherein infinite progress is possible, revolutionising in the helpful sense the life of Man even as air power in the destructive sense has revolutionised the art of War. 'Our future is not very bright' : indeed, at the moment it is non-existent. It has to be recalled to life : all power, then, to Lord Swinton's elbow in his task.

Secondly, of paramount importance to many thousands, though necessarily temporary in its nature, is the repairing of houses shattered by the flying bomb attacks, now happily so very largely a menace overcome. A certain clergyman, speaking feelingly, made recently a number of comments upon the slackness and inadequacy of the repairing squads, with the result that he was immediately challenged with acerbity to produce his evidence. First-hand evidence of really conclusive value in such a matter can come only from those directly concerned but this can and should be recorded, it is difficult to find any estate agent or property manager or private builder in London or around who is not bitterly critical of the activities, or lack of activities, of the Ministry of Works, and in the House of Commons, though Mr Hicks replied

with energy to the many critics of that Ministry, his reply, we are told by 'The Times' (not an unfriendly observer) was 'neither comprehensive nor wholly convincing.' We have heard a great deal about the number of skilled work-people brought to London to deal with the repairs : we have even been regaled with accounts of their lodgment in hotels and the meals and so forth prepared for them, but the fact remains that those experts such as I have mentioned have had no word but extremely caustic condemnation of the working of the Ministry and of the repairers, and, in truth, some quite distressing stories have been going the rounds. This, again, it may be sincerely hoped, is but another instance of our usual bad beginnings : this comment refers to the state of things in October, and the months of November and December may—it is devoutly to be trusted, will—see a vast improvement and speeding up so that at least houses slightly damaged may have been made habitable again before the onset of winter.

Alongside this is the fuel muddle. For more than a generation the coal industry has been prolific of crises, and they do not disappear even in war. The fuel position is a tragedy : how much of that is inevitable it is impossible for any but one long experienced in the industry to determine—long experienced and impartial, if any one who is both can be found. What strikes the ordinary consumer as avoidable is the absurdity of conflicting directions : he is told to lay in stocks and penalised for or precluded from doing so. The many rather childish posters of provident squirrels holding lumps of coal in contended paws or of improvident humans shivering in empty coal-scuttles are just so much wasted paper, effort, and expense, besides being a constant reminder of exasperation. We shall end, I personally have no doubt whatever, in complete nationalisation of the industry, though whether that will prove the panacea fondly supposed is certainly questionable ; but meanwhile are all these divergent counsels, these spasmodic urges and limitations, really necessary ? That at any rate is a question with which we have become painfully familiar on every railway hoarding : it should more rightly be applied to the fuel wrangles.

The third matter to which I referred as attracting a

great deal of public and private attention, the treatment of the Home Guard, has had, as far as can be judged, no side of justification whatsoever. Civil aviation, bomb repairs, coal and the rest bristle, no doubt, with difficulties, involving as they do many diverse interests and considerations. Not so the Home Guard. The treatment of this great Army, the cheapest our land has ever known and certainly not the least efficient, has been undignified and, indeed, ungenerous. Throughout the early autumn for weeks in succession no one in it really knew whether he was officially alive or dead : as a Company Commander I was not 'stood down' nor were the men, and yet it was not possible to order a single parade or guard : nothing but the spirit of this Army which remained impervious to official ways kept it going as it did. At last the anomaly was removed, but up to the very end of October, after the lengthy, unseemly argument as to such material points as the retention of the old boots in which we had all worn out so many pairs of our own socks, we were informed we might have 'ceremonial' parades but not make any use of such a word as 'farewell' : the latter were only to be one month after we were officially 'stood down.' As standing down is obviously the equivalent of official death (though burial can only be the order 'dismiss') we were apparently expected to say farewell one month after we were dead. And orders continued to flow, often inconsistent, from the B.B.C. and the public press, and not through our official channels. Now, it is announced that we start standing down as November begins and complete the process as the year ends, with all the intermediate ceremony and His Majesty's words to us on December 3 : I suppose it makes sense to the War Office, somehow.

In brief, the demise of a very remarkable and entirely characteristic British force, all the members of which have unstintingly given their time and labour, many of them for over four and a half years, has not been marked with the consistency and consideration that might have made it memorable. Finally, though that is not the fault of the War Office, there is the further cause of offence in the dispute as to whether Home Guardsmen are or are not to be eligible for membership of the British Legion. That seems, in all the circumstances, marvellously unimportant : what is more material is the still undecided question

(November 3) are we or are we not going to be allowed to retain enough rifles and be given enough ammunition for the formation of rifle clubs, on the good old analogy of 'shooting at the butts,' the hobby and pleasure of the early Middle Ages? At all events what has, in effect, been said to us was said to Judah by Jahaziel, son of Zechariah, 'Ye shall not need to fight in this battle: set yourselves, stand ye still, and see the salvation of the Lord.'

Since we are on the path of criticism—and all along it lie bricks ready to hand to throw at the Government—let us mention several that are, perhaps, unavoidable associates of war and will, it is hoped and believed, pass from us as the war passes. But, first, two interpolations without mention of which no true picture of these days can be presented. In order of time, we have to note the fact that Sir William Beveridge has chosen to set sail from the secure harbourage of the headship of an Oxford College for the perilous seas of the House of Commons and has been started off—a start that set Parliamentary tongues wagging curiously—by a public handshake from the Prime Minister. We are launched on the path of what is euphemistically termed 'Social Security' and if Sir William Jowitt is the helmsman it is evident that the other Sir William is in the chart-room. How much will the nation drink Beveridge, M.P.? We shall see what we shall see: we are emphatically told we can afford the immense new burdens to be laid upon enterprises and individuals alike, provided—and a long, long stress upon that word—we work much harder, of which there is but little expectation. Secondly, and just when his great and wise guidance is and will be so sorely needed and in so many fields, both spiritual and temporal, William Temple is taken from us suddenly: there is more than one who will be able adequately to sustain the weight, for the Church of England is not poor in men at the top these days, but there was only one William Temple and, after a woefully short reign at Lambeth, he is gone—a real national, even international, tragedy.

To return to the bricks—my first is milk. In the big towns it is doubtless beyond criticism, in London, of which alone in this connection I have recent experience, it certainly is; in the country, from which, after all, the

milk comes, no. In the happy days before the war, for instance I was able to get milk, fresh and excellent, from a neighbouring farm : now it all passes my doorway and goes to the collecting centre some miles away where it is pooled and from which it is re-issued later, often much later, in consequence of which in London it keeps two or three days, in the country it is often sour the same evening as it is received. The delays may be inevitable, they are undeniably injurious : moreover, milk seems to be much more plentiful per head of the population in London than in the country.

My second minor brick is paper—and it, like milk, is not really so very minor. How is it that paper is available for so much that is trivial or worse and not available for serious use ? We are told that 100,000 tons were allotted to the Stationery Office for 22,000 to all publishers, a truly scandalous inequality when one considers the appalling waste of paper by Government offices ; as only one instance of many, every Home Guard officer must in the course of his four and half years' service have received a mass of booklets and leaflets of which he made no use and could make no use whatever. When the minds of millions are being stirred to thoughts of knowledge or at least inquiry beyond all expectation, to put this unequal limitation upon the production of good literature is a very serious reflection upon the wisdom of the authority concerned.

A third minor brick is the unexplained and, as far as any outside listener or reader can judge, unjustified, slowness in the release of certain items of news. Recently a speaker on the wireless told all who tuned in to his account a tale of personal adventure in an air raid that occurred in the winter of 1941, prefacing it by saying that it was only now that he had been given permission to tell it : it was interesting as a personal adventure, it revealed absolutely nothing in the way of military or aeronautical secret and could with equal propriety have been given publicity directly after it had occurred. This brick may sound very minor indeed and so it would be in fact if it were not symptomatic of the official attitude towards so many of the events of the war : this is sometimes so unforthcoming that a casual dweller in these islands might almost be led to believe that the war was

being fought by the Americans, with some help from the Russians, and every now and again a spasmodic effort by a few others such as Canadians, Australians, Frenchmen, or Poles. English, Scottish, or Welsh activities are seldom given their due, and the general effect is rather a distortion in consequence. It may be all very well, very characteristic and all that, of the British to hide their light under a bushel, but it might also be urged that it could do no harm to let the world at large know that we have, and have had, a light to hide.

A little bit larger than minor is the education endeavour. It is hateful to be a Cassandra, but it does sometimes happen to be a person's fate. At length, weeks and weeks after the passage through Parliament of Mr Butler's Education Act, it is beginning to dawn upon the public that those who pointed out, with all their power and persistence, that the measure could not conceivably be put into operation for a long time to come since that depended upon the supply in adequate numbers of qualified teachers are unhappily absolutely right. It argues really a lack of courage in the Government that the amendment to raise the school-leaving age to fifteen by April 1945 was not resolutely resisted : there was no one in the least degree intimately acquainted with educational reality who did not know that that was a sheer impossibility, and yet the announcement, when it came, of the postponement of the date was greeted with pained disappointment, and now that process has proceeded further, and the truth is beginning to percolate fairly widely, that the supply of teachers, the adequate supply of adequately trained teachers, be it understood—for there is considerable talk of undesirable dilution—is the essence of the whole reform, and there is, as yet, very little sign indeed of suitable action by the Ministry of Education.

Instead, there is the easy argument, first, that all teachers serving in the Forces should have first priority in demobilisation, and, secondly, that after the war, young folk in great numbers will desire to enter the teaching profession. As to the first, in the debates in July in the House of Lords, I gave chapter and verse, from direct, personal knowledge of the sequence of events in 1918-19, to prove the impossibility of both demobilising teachers and of educating the still undemobilised Armies

at one and the same time, and Lord Selborne, replying on behalf of the Government, was good enough to observe that he had no doubt that I was right. But no one pays any attention : the demand to get the teachers out the moment the firing ceases and the plans for re-educating the serving millions of men and women before demobilisation are cheerfully being blended together in a chorus as illogical and impractical as can be devised—and the result will be chaotic, if it is not worse than that. And, secondly, it is quite certain that young folk in great numbers will not desire to enter the teaching profession—unless there is a duly recognised teaching profession to enter, and on his refusal to recognise the teaching profession Mr Butler has made it clear that he and his Ministry are adamant. And that, as a comedian might say, were it a fit subject for comedy, is that.

Let us turn, for variety, to something for which emphatically the Government is not responsible. The Government has done its best, in its supremely difficult task, to hold the balance fairly between all sections of the nation ; it may not invariably have succeeded, but it has tried with a great degree of impartiality. Nevertheless, due no doubt to the strain, the ever-increasing strain, of this all-embracing conflict, the spectre of class-bitterness contrives to raise its ugly head, especially against such as have, often through no choice of their own, the burden of what is called ‘a handle to their name.’ In proof, here is an extract from an article in a well-known paper :

‘ Titles, to-day, in three-quarters of the cases in which they are held, mean nothing, or even something worse than nothing . . . of course inheritance has not made them all vicious, or even idle fellows. Some do a spot of service by lending their impressive names to adorn the note-paper and prospectuses of joint stock companies. Some run wide estates, on obsolete methods, by proxy again, through agents and factors. Apart from the lineal lot you find men on the list, men who have damned themselves by their own unguarded words and shady deeds.’

The first part is what a generation ago we termed ‘ Limehouse,’ but it is considerably embittered, even for that : by the second I was set wondering how the chairman of the proprietors of the paper in which this appeared, Lord Southwood, can have liked coming under the scurrilous

lash of his unsigned contributor. This extract would, of course, be as wholly lacking in importance as it is in accuracy were it not that, increasingly, people can be found who enjoy being offensive to any one who bears a title. They think, presumably, that they are demonstrating that they are as good as the person they are addressing : they are, in truth, demonstrating the reverse. The whole is analogous to the action of the school-boys who kicked the young son of a distinguished father, to boast afterwards that they had. In actual practice to-day there are for all ordinary purposes no class distinctions but two, namely, the civil and the uncivil, those who wish to help their fellows and those who are set on helping themselves ; it is at any rate a happiness to know that, though the latter are not few, they are still very considerably in the minority of the British people.

Nevertheless the strain of this terrific war is telling—upon eyes notably, so a prominent oculist told me, and upon nerves and strength generally, whilst I greatly doubt whether, even yet, it is fully realised what we, above all other nations, are asking of our women-folk. As I passed along a London thoroughfare the other day I overheard one woman say to another, ‘Do you know, my dear, every one’s at the end of their tether’ : that every one is not, nor, in these islands, ever will be : ‘de thorybreds go with de heds up till de drap,’ as the old negro saying has it. But women of all ages and kinds have worked and are working almost unendurably hard. ‘And what are you doing now ?’ asked an elegant American officer of a peeress who is at any rate old enough to have served as a V.A.D. in the last war and was, for once, out at a party with her grown-up daughter who was enjoying ‘a spot of leave’ from one of the Services. ‘Scrubbing,’ was the brief, unexpected, all-sufficing reply.

‘Time marches on.’ Nearly eight million women and girls between the ages of fourteen and sixty-four are to-day working in national service : the rest and the over-sixty fours are working to fill the gaps in the personal labours of life. It is said to reflect on the other kind of gaps, the gaps in mental equipment necessarily made by the essential labours of war. There is one comforting thought, though, for the future : it seems certain that there has been an enormous acceleration in the invention

of numerous appliances to lighten labour in the post-war homes—when these come into being. Already we are promised not merely gadgets of every kind but new devices, new practicalities, new foods. One of the latest suggestions as to these last is at first hearing undeniably unattractive : I read in an article by 'a doctor of science' that 'considerable quantities of hair fall to the barbers' shears every day and find their way into the dust-bin. This waste of protein is deplorable but efforts are now being made,' etc. From this sheared hair, we are told, we are to get, in the future, 'a thick, black, tarry-looking liquid,' from which, again, will be extracted a white substance entitled cystine ; this, in its turn, will get us fit quickly after illness—unless we prefer the illness. Certainly we laymen hardly realise the potentialities of the world to be.

'Meanwhile there is our earth here'—as Browning very truthfully reminded us : and that is an earth still drenched with war, to the normal horrors of which have been added so many of the abnormal horrors of the torture-chambers and concentration-camps of the Gestapo. Never, never again—that is the inflexible resolve of the United Nations. It seems anomalous just at this time, when the vast converging movements of the Armies and Air Forces of these Nations, assisted, fathered, and in large measure controlled by their Navies, are taking visible shape, when foot is set upon German soil and the 'last lap,' to use Mr Churchill's most favourable words, is entered upon, when too the same inexorable progress is seen in the Pacific, that the American nation should have to be engaged again in the difficult and distracting ardours of a Presidential election. That will be over before this even reaches the printer : in a few days (I write on November 3) the world will know whether the destinies of the great Republic will be governed for a fourth term by President Roosevelt or by the new hand of Mr Dewey : all that one from the British Isles may note, with deep satisfaction, is the fact stated by 'The Times' in these words on October 23, 'In the last weeks of what promises to be a closely contested campaign it is profoundly reassuring to see that the great issues of American foreign policy are not involved in the inevitable partisanship.' Cold comfort in any event for Herr Adolf Hitler, the silent,

whitening scourge of the human race : and here, in Great Britain all seem agreed to accept the Prime Minister's advice to keep off party conflict until the war is won.

All the efforts of the German diplomats—not that any German ever was, or could be, a diplomat—have not succeeded in driving any wedge between the great Allies. With the United States of America, for all our differences of interest in civil aviation, commerce, and other matters of national moment, we stand four-square as brothers-in-arms : with the Union of Soviet Republics we are, as the Prime Minister has so recently stated, more firmly linked than ever in our history and certainly, to bear that out, there has never been anything before like the public cordiality of the meetings in Moscow. The Nazis' last hope is as the setting sun, which is the obvious present emblem of the Empire of Japan.

We may be critical of the Government in home affairs, though it has wonderfully outridden the storm over the compensation clauses of the Town Planning Bill—it would be miraculous if we were not. But in foreign and war affairs, on the success of which, after all, every aspect of home affairs depends, the Government of Mr Churchill has a record unequalled, and gathers, not loses, strength. Even the Polish problem seems to-day a little less obdurate, and the tragedy of Warsaw, which so tugged at the heart, lies behind. In front, everywhere, is hope and more than hope, certainty : desperate as is the resistance, it is now on all sides of the German Reich a resistance of despair and, as my readers may remember, I for one have not been able to help feeling that the prolonging of such resistance spelt in the end more permanent peace. It is only by the utter destruction of the German will to war that that peace can be given back to mankind, and that can be brought about by nothing more surely than by ineffective resistance in the rubble of German cities and in the craters of German fields.

On the afternoon of the day, at October's end, when at long last official intimation came that the Home Guard was no more to be hung out to dry, suspended in air like Mahomet's coffin, I took an hour or two off all work to revisit one of the key-points in the downland territory for the defence of which I had, nominally, borne responsibility ever since those hectic days in mid-May 1940. It

lies high up on the South Downs far from all human habitation, commanding all the adjacent countryside. The afternoon was English autumn at its lovely best. Away to my right, towards Chanctonbury, guns thundered—in practice, not reality : over my head a pair of aeroplanes zoomed and manœuvred—ours, not the enemy's ; behind and below me lay the line of the sea, the silver streak of the Channel, of an importance beyond all telling. And, like Sir Bedevere—though without his boldness—I found myself 'revolving many memories.' I have walked these downs in all seasons, weathers, moods, directions, and costumes, by day and by night, at dusk and at dawn, in peace and in war : it was impossible not to be revisited by the days, the peace-filled and yet uneasy days, before Dunkirk, the anguish and anxiety of Dunkirk itself, the long hard climb up from darkness into light after Dunkirk. I thought of those hours when, scarcely armed, we trod these downs in faith and of the latter months when, fully equipped and increasingly efficient, we held our exercises over them. Few agree with Sir James Grigg's odd remark that the members of the Home Guard regretted that they had never had occasion to repel the enemy upon our loved land : but an attempt would have been made—to the death, as we all knew. And 'stand down' has come to us, at last.

Not yet the end. Full well must every thoughtful student of events realise that these two months of November and December will see some of the most bitter struggles of all this most bitter war ; but nevertheless and without trying to magnify the importance of the Home Guard, which has, as we fully are aware, only played out its little fragment of a part in the mighty concept—and bloodlessly too, thanks to the eternal Mercy—its 'stand down' has an unmistakable significance. Not the end, but very definitely and positively the beginning of the end. Between my footsteps and the guns thundering in practice over the farther ridge stretched many a tank-track, many an old trench, many a strand of wire : the wire was all rusted and in places coiled for removal ; the trenches were being quietly filled in, not by Man, but by the fingers of the winds and the rains of Time ; in the old tank-tracks grass and mushrooms were already growing. The healing hand was being laid on all—and

so it will be with this blasted, tortured, and in places starving world. Not yet, not the end, but, even as there was a time when the most appropriate words were 'Be strong and of a good courage ; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed : for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest,' so now we can say aloud, 'The night is far spent, the day is at hand,' and we can resolve in our hearts that when the great and unforgettable hour comes on which we can truthfully cry, 'Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ !' we shall mean victory over more than our enemies.

GORELL.

*P.S., Dec. 4.*—These have been testing days comparable, in my judgment, only to those which saw the bitter battling round and in and for Caen. Deep was then the anxiety with which we at home followed that battling ; it seemed to us—and perhaps it was—that the whole enterprise of the second Norman Conquest, so brilliantly begun on D-day, hung in the balance : it was succeeded, as all the world now knows, by the Victory of France and the Freedom of Belgium, that mighty, and it then appeared irresistible, onrush right up to the gallantry of Arnhem. At that point the German Armies, after having experienced the biggest and most overwhelming defeat in their history, were pulled again into standing form : they were back on their short and excellent communications, they were also defending the soil of the Fatherland itself. Again has the battling grown most bitter and those who were vocally most sanguine have grown silent. And yet back, back, back have these German Armies still been pressed, and to that, as all students of military history know, there can, in their situation and in these present circumstances, be but one end. Whether that end will come whilst 1944 is still with us or later is uncertain, but come it will and with finally devastating force. And one thing more is very sure, the peace of the world will be enhanced by this stubborn yard-by-yard resistance on German soil far more than it would have if our enemy had cracked completely after his defeat in France.

This is the unmistakable outline and importance of these dour days—but how the strain is telling on the world we can see by what we may term the liberation pains of Greece and Belgium, and the Polish inability to face up to facts is a tragedy. To offset that, we have the crossing of the Danube, preceding that of the Rhine. Meanwhile at Chicago we agree to disagree, as friends can, and at home Mr Churchill turns seventy, with the plaudits of the thinking world : with his characteristic veering away from relaxation he has omitted 'early' from his mention of the 'early summer' as a likely time for hostilities to end. Undismayed, Britain continues ; she has at last told the world the figures of her vast effort, and it does not cease. And as for politics, the General Election is not yet and its date, when it comes, will be Mr Churchill's choice : perhaps—for wonders do happen in Britain in and after war—by then the mine-owners and the miners will have found a *modus operandi* which does not lead immediately to harsh recrimination—or is that too much to think possible ?

## SOME RECENT BOOKS.

**Bath.** R. A. Lendon Smith.  
**A Short History of Germany.** Dr S. H. Steinberg.  
**Max Weber and German Politics.** J. P. Mayer.  
**Japan's Political Warfare.** Peter de Mendelsohn.  
**The Logic of War.** Squadron Leader Murray Harris.  
**The Passing of the European Age.** Dr Eric Fischer.  
**The Popish Plot.** Sir John Pollock, Bt.  
**British Woodland Trees.** H. L. Edlin.

**Queen Mary College.** George Godwin.  
**Nineteenth Century Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature 1890-1899 with Supplementary Indexing 1900-1922.** Edited by Helen Grant Cushing and Adah V. Morris.  
**Airborne Invasion.** John Hetherington.  
**How to Study an Old Church.** A. Needham.  
**The Royal Society 1660-1940.** Sir Henry Lyons.

'Bath,' by R. A. Lendon Smith (Batsford), is sure of a warm welcome, sad though its beginning and ending are. Bishop Mathew's preface tells of the death of the talented author last April at the early age of twenty-eight, while the Epilogue tells of the devastation caused by the German air attacks in 1942. Mr Smith refers to 'the vast literature that Bath has inspired throughout the centuries,' but yet there is room for more. It is a remarkable story of how a small provincial watering place became the glorious Bath of the eighteenth century '*par excellence* the summer colony of the *beau monde*: the resort of the leaders of fashion, wit, and public affairs,' and thereafter the transformation of 'the Mecca of gay birds of passage into the last refuge of half-pay officers and retired civil servants,' though this comment is unduly drastic. Four names sum up the glory of Bath—Nash, Oliver, Allen, and Wood. After them came the Bath of Smollett, Sheridan, and Jane Austen, still famous but lacking the brilliance of the reign of Beau Nash. If there is any criticism to be made it is of an inadequate map, hard to read and not even showing Lansdowne Crescent. Possibly also a little more about famous houses and a little less quotation from Jane Austen would please many readers. The illustrations are numerous and excellent—up to Batsford standard, and no higher praise can be given—while the wrapper is a thing of delight and well worth framing.

Dr S. H. Steinberg's 'A Short History of Germany' (Cambridge University Press) is a striking example of

concentrated and well-ordered information, really requiring several volumes for proper elucidation, but packed into one volume of about 300 pages. The permutations and combinations of the Holy Roman Empire up to the eighteenth century are bewildering and even when set down with Dr Steinberg's skill make no easy reading. From the seventeenth century on the most striking developments are connected with the rise of Prussia and all it stood for—Prussia, whose supreme goddesses, as the author says, were *Disciplina* and *Bellona*, whose soulless efficiency of bureaucracy and militarism crushed all liberal ideas and whose rule of life was blood and iron. And so we pass from Frederick the Great to Bismarck—from William II to Hitler. Till 1871 there was no political unit called Germany, nor even German passports, except in the names of the component States, till 1934. There was never any real partnership because to Prussia good neighbourliness meant nothing, dominance everything. 'The history of the Germanies is the history of the unending struggle of the Continental Teutons for a working compromise between uniformity and disruption. Uniformity was and is contrary to the racial, cultural, and political divergency of the Germanic tribes: the complete independence of each part would have been and will be contrary to the economic, cultural, and political interests of those very parts.' Not even Prussian dominance has solved the problem in the past. What will solve it in the future? In considering this, readers will find Dr Steinberg's book most instructive.

In no country in the world has the Professor had such power and influence as in Germany. The three main roots of German life were the Army, the Civil Service, and the Professors, and, in many ways, the last were the most dangerous. Even Hitler had to find a John the Baptist in the renegade Englishman, Houston Stewart Chamberlain. All this is excellently brought out in '*Max Weber and German Politics*', by J. P. Mayer (Faber and Faber). To most Englishmen Max Weber is little more than a name, yet his political ideas were prevalent and powerful throughout Germany from 1880 to 1920. The author says that Weber not only wrote about politics; 'he made politics' by his writings and teaching! He was unquestionably a pioneer of the study

of Sociology, and, as such, was a European figure. As late as 1916 Weber wrote : 'We are a power-State. For every power-State the proximity of another power-State means a restriction on the liberty of its own political decision.' A faith (it is no less) such as this means that for any foreseeable period Germany must, and will, continue to try to dominate Europe—whatever the setbacks and whatever the consequences. Weber continues : 'Only in a hard struggle between men and men can elbow room be won in our earthly existence.' Two more brief quotations must close this too brief note on a valuable and timely study. 'Politics,' Weber maintained, 'without belief (*Glaube*) is impossible,' and 'we (Germany) must not ask after the war who was guilty, because it was the structure of society which produced the war.' So much for the foolish division of Germans into good and bad ; or for the hope of building, without faith, a better world.

'Japan conducts political warfare on totalitarian lines without possessing fully totalitarian machinery,' writes Mr Peter de Mendelssohn in '*Japan's Political Warfare*' (Allen and Unwin). Readers of this informative and comprehensive book may well wonder how the machinery could be more fully totalitarian. The radio, the newspapers, books, films, news agencies, science, and art, are all fitted securely into this machine for spreading Japanese ideas, aims, achievements, and philosophy of life over the world. This book may seem to be rather like an official report, replete with concentrated information and detailed fact, but for those who trouble to digest its contents there will be good reward. Finally to sum up in the author's own words, it is Japan's doctrine that 'firstly, war waged by Japan on other nations is a mother's chastisement of her naughty children into obedience so that their conduct may be duly rectified. Secondly, war waged by other nations on Japan is a mortal sin, an assault by the child-nations on the mother-nation which will be punished by the gods for the crime it is—matricide.' That, worked out in its utterly preposterous details, is what Japan is proclaiming to-day.

'The power that rules communications rules the world. So long as we control our life-lines, it is inconceivable that we should be beaten, for the very simple reason that we

and our friends have a dozen times the enemy's capacity for producing the tools of war and many times his manpower.' So writes Squadron-Leader Murray Harris in his most interesting book '*The Logic of War*' (Allen and Unwin). And that is the key to the whole work. It was estimated that in 1942 each individual soldier needed 11½ tons of equipment, and when armies are reckoned in millions the terrific problems of supply and transport are evident. 'In 1918 the Germans were hopelessly over-extended and we will find that it is on this selfsame uncharted rock—over-extension—that the German war machine has foundered again.' 'Strategy is the study of communications.' The truth of these remarks is being fully proved now. The author gives a most informative survey of our lines of communication and sources of supply and the enemy's, including some interesting discussion on the special value of Egypt and of Industrial Strategy for Peace, showing how Germany can successfully be controlled in future. The book can be confidently recommended to all students of the problems of war and peace.

In '*The Passing of the European Age*' (Oxford University Press) Dr Eric Fischer of Harvard University seeks to prove that power, in the widest sense, is passing from Europe to the New World. His sub-title is '*A Study of the Transfer of Western Civilisation and its Renewal in Other Continents*.' Similar studies have appeared, but Dr Fischer carries the question a step farther than previous writers in seeking to estimate the reflex influences which the new culture centres exercise later on the mother country; these influences he tends to exaggerate. The amount of new culture reflected back to Ireland, or even Spain, by Irish and Spanish emigrants is almost impossible to estimate, but cannot be large. On the other side, although some forty million Brazilians speak Portuguese, that does not make them any less Brazilians, any more than a common language makes an American a Briton. Dr Fischer again exaggerates when he says: 'It is now generally agreed that the British Empire can no longer be called a European country.' He quotes J. R. Green, Conan Doyle, and W. T. Stead as supporting the view that the centre of British gravity was shifting westward. It may have appeared so in 1900, but two

world wars have surely proved that the British Empire is, and always will be, British, and that it is one and indivisible. He also quotes that unsatisfactory Austrian theorist Coudenhove-Kalergi as excluding Britain and Russia from Pan-Europe. Both these great empires are, for good or ill, solidly in Europe to-day, and there must stay. Written to prove a thesis, Dr Fischer's study is more interesting and provocative than conclusive.

It is pleasant in these days of paper famine, when innumerable good old books are going out of print, to find one of forty years ago revived. The Cambridge University Press is to be congratulated on the new edition of Sir John Pollock's '*The Popish Plot*', first published in 1903. It is a work of eminent historical scholarship and as a study of the reign of Charles II is of great value beyond the limits suggested by the title. The study of the murder of Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey throws light on that historic mystery, while Part IV, describing the Treason trials, gives most interesting information about criminal procedure and judicial habits of the period. Parts I and III, describing the designs of the Roman Catholics and the Politics of the Plot, examine the actual small basis of truth on which the immense superstructure of the Plot was built and the to us almost incredible success of the monstrous Oates and his fellow witnesses. As the author writes, 'The unbounded immorality with which the politics of the reign of Charles II were stamped so clouded the minds of men that truth became for them almost undistinguishable from falsehood.' Charles himself stands out as a very astute, energetic, and determined politician, and by no means the idle debauchee which so many writers have made him. Shaftesbury was both extremely able and unprincipled, but he was no match for Charles.

Books on trees evoke happy memories, ranging from the comprehensive, learned, and indispensable volumes of Mr W. J. Bean to the small popular handbooks for the unerudite. Messrs. Batsford seem to have found a gap in the chain, a book designed to meet the needs of trained foresters and students of forestry, but yet appealing to and of value to all those whose work or recreation brings them into touch with the trees of the countryside—in

fact, for the keen but only moderately erudite. The book is 'British Woodland Trees,' by H. L. Edlin, and very successfully it achieves the aim set out above. The 133 illustrations from photographs, engravings, and drawings are as attractive as the text is informative. First comes a short chapter on the growth of trees, then thirty-six chapters on the various species dealt with, then a chapter on the study of trees and keys to the broad-leaved and coniferous varieties and a glossary. This is all obviously most useful for the serious student and an invitation to the casual tree lover to exercise his brains and become more expert.

'Queen Mary College,' by George Godwin (Acorn Press), though published in October 1944, bears the title-page date of 1939, and this explains its attractive peace-time format of large type, wide margins, and good paper so sadly missed in war-time productions. It is lamentable that very many readers will have to confess to ignorance of the existence of Queen Mary College. In fact, it is the present most dignified name of the former East London College, which was itself the child of Beaumont's Philosophical Institute, formed over a century ago and afterwards most unsuitably yoked with The People's Palace in Mile End Road. Mr Godwin has a remarkable story to tell of the steady development of the College, often in spite of great financial and local difficulties, into what it is now an honoured component part, under Royal Charter, of the University of London, wisely and energetically carrying on its work as the University of East London in peace time, though largely transferred to Cambridge in war time. Much of this success is due to one outstanding man, the late Principal Hatton, with a determined and enthusiastic band of assistants, and to the continuing and munificent financial support of the Drapers' Company. The second half of the book is somewhat like a report on the various branches of the College's activity, science, engineering, arts, research, etc., and also recreation, but it is only right that these should be recorded, to show how widely and how well Beaumont's old Institute has grown and developed.

Students of literature are deeply indebted to the H. W. Wilson Company of New York for their enterprise in producing the 'Nineteenth Century Readers' Guide

to Periodical Literature 1890-1899 with Supplementary Indexing 1900-1922,' edited by Helen Grant Cushing and Adah V. Morris. A complete index of contributions to over fifty British and American periodicals is given in these two immense volumes of over 1,500 pages each. The meticulous care and skill required by the compilation are obvious to all readers, and hearty thanks and congratulations are due to the painstaking editors. Such works of reference are as useful on the shelf as they are difficult to review. All that a notice can do is to act as a signpost to this valuable quarry of information for students.

Until the end of the war lightens the hand of the Censor, 'Airborne Invasion,' by John Hetherington (Allen and Unwin), will be the best and most comprehensive account of the German invasion of Crete. It is a good book. It cannot yet be judged whether or not more could have been done to strengthen the defences or to improve or increase the airfields from which defending aircraft could have operated ; but with circumstances as they were many valuable lessons can be learnt by arm-chair strategists as indeed they were learnt by allied planning staffs and put into practice for the invasion of Normandy. There is much that is astonishing in this campaign : the crippling casualties that were inflicted upon the German airborne troops by a courageous defence in spite of German air superiority ; the nearness to the failure of the invasion, particularly as a result of the Navy's quick and skilful destruction of the German seaborne reinforcements ; and most important of all the fact that Crete, which might have been the springboard for an attack capable of destroying the allied control of the Near and Middle East, became the tomb of German airborne intentions by reason of a force of defenders inadequately equipped but resolute.

Old churches have a perennial fascination and anything that helps to explain them is valuable. 'How to Study an Old Church,' by A. Needham (Batsford), is a most excellent guide to this. In about seventy pages we are told what to look for and how to judge the age and characteristics of what we find. The programme is a full one—graveyards and headstones, towers, spires, porches, doors, fonts, screens, pulpits, lecterns, monuments, bench

ends, pews, wall paintings, roofs, arches, mouldings, iron-work emblems, stained glass, and plate—much useful information is given about all, and the many illustrations are, in accordance with Batsford tradition, excellent. All church visitors should have this book.

'The Royal Society 1660-1940,' by Sir Henry Lyons (Cambridge University Press), is a notable tribute to a famous institution and a fitting memorial to its distinguished author, who carried through the work during years of ever increasing physical disability, borne with never failing patience, fortitude, and good humour. He lived to see the last proofs passed for press but not the finished volume. No reader can fail to appreciate the immense labour and meticulous care and extensive knowledge that such a work entails. In the middle of the seventeenth century certain learned scientists met informally for discussion. From this was born the Royal Society which was incorporated by Royal Charter in 1662, largely by the influence of Lord Brouncker and Sir Robert Moray. Its object was for the study and encouragement of natural science and its professionally most important members were scientists, but, whereas scientists were often not rich men, and funds were precarious, many eminent Fellows who were but amateurs or even entirely unscientific were admitted for financial reasons. Hence many difficulties and it was only after 1840 that scientists gained complete control. There were many difficult years to start with, but under such presidents as Sir Isaac Newton, Sir Hans Sloane, and Sir Joseph Banks they were finally overcome and the Society reached the fame and eminence which it has so long and so deservedly enjoyed. Sir Henry Lyons in this large and well-arranged volume, packed with information, records the growth and development of the Society, its membership, activities, meetings, endowments, successive homes, collections, and eminent members. It is a notable work.

*Page 494 (October 1944). In the review of 'Irish Public Opinion' the author's name was given as McDonell instead of McDowell. The Editor expresses his regret for the error.*

# World News by Magazine

This has been our business for over seventy years and we feel competent to give you the service which you desire.

We are the largest and most reliable agency for prompt delivery of Foreign and Domestic Periodicals in this Country.

The latest English, Irish and German Publications we carry in stock.

We call especial attention to the beautiful Christmas Editions, forming a group of magazines that have a peculiar interest to people of culture.

Our subscription prices include postage to all parts of the United States, Cuba, Mexico, Porto Rico and P. I.

Our BACK NUMBER DEPT. can furnish quick service in supplying you with old issues.

For quick and efficient service send your orders for Foreign Publications to

**THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY**

Division of THE AMERICAN NEWS COMPANY, INC.

131 Varick Street, New York City

*Send for Price List*



